MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
Tuesday, November 16 2010
UU220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: Approval of minutes for the Academic Senate meetings of September 17, October 5,
and October 26 2010 (pp. 2-22).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Regular Reports:
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:
H. Committee and Caucus Chairs:

IV. Special Report(s):
A. Jim Maraviglia: Update on MCA criteria, impact of AB 2401
B. Brian Tietje: New roles for Continuing Education

V. Consent Agenda:

VI. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Academic Senate Operating Procedures for Its Committees:
   Executive Committee, second reading (pp. 23-27).
B. Resolution on Initiatives in Conflict with Cal Poly Mission Statement:
   Executive Committee, second reading (p. 28).
C. Resolution on Academic Senate Fairness Board Description and Procedures:
   Executive Committee, second reading (pp. 29-35).
D. Resolution on Academic Dishonesty: Cheating and Plagiarism Procedures:
   Executive Committee, second reading (pp. 36-40).
E. Resolution on RPT Report: Graham Archer, chair of the Faculty Affairs
   Committee, first reading (pp. 41-51).
F. Resolution on the Establishment of a Subcommittee of the Academic Senate
   Curriculum Committee to Review Graduate Curricula: Executive Committee,
   first reading (pp. 52-54).

VII. Discussion Item(s):

VIII. Adjournment:
I. Welcome: (Rachel Fernflores, Academic Senate Chair) The Chair welcomed attendees and made brief introductions.

II. Reports:
Interim President Robert Glidden and Provost Robert Koob presented opening remarks.

III. Presentation:

1. Short summary of some Senate activities this year: (Fernflores) Senate committees will join with WASC working groups to form joint task forces that will be drafting resolutions on Integration and Student Learning, Learn by Doing, Strategic Plan, and the Teacher-Scholar Model. Some questions the Provost has asked the faculty to consider include: Is the Strategic Plan, as it's written, something we, the faculty, want to execute? What performance indicators do we think we should be measured by in our roles as faculty members?

Three additional task forces will be established in January 2011. One is the Assessment Task Force. Its task is to make a recommendation for a university-wide assessment project that the faculty can endorse. In fall all departments will be asked to complete an assessment activity worksheet showing how, or whether, the department’s program objectives align with university learning objectives. These will be used to determine what type of university-wide assessment project we need according to what we want to assess.

[The URL to the following documents, including the assessment activity worksheet that will go out to all departments, is provided for reference]:
http://academicsenate.calpoly.edu/documents.html

University Learning Objectives (ULO) - Program Learning Objectives (PLO) Alignment Activity Assessment Activity Instructions Assessment Activity Part I Assessment Activity Part II Hierarchy of Learning Outcomes ULO Presentation (Power Point)
Other task forces to be formed later in the year are a General Education Task Force and an Honor’s Program Task Force.

2. **Strategic Plan:** (Fernflores) The Chair reviewed the key issues in the proposed Cal Poly Strategic Plan. Erling Smith is the author of the proposed Plan. A strategic plan is needed where all programs at the University can find themselves.

**IV. Assigned Activity:**
An “Academic Senate Retreat Strategic Plan Activity” sheet was provided to each table (attached). Each table was asked to discuss and provide a group answer to the questions and definitions on the activity sheet.

**V. Large group reporting of activity results:**
Group answers were collected and organized (attached).

**VI. Adjournment:** 5:00pm

Prepared by:

Margaret Camuso
Academic Senate
Academic Senate Retreat
Strategic Plan Activity

Instructions:
Please appoint someone to record in this document the answers to the prompts below. In so recording, hit “save” periodically.

Quick General Question:

1. What is the most effective way for the WASC-Senate task forces (Teacher-Scholar; Learn-by-Doing; Integration and Student Learning; Strategic Plan) to solicit and obtain faculty input?

Strategic Plan Questions:

2. What are the three most important issues in the Strategic Plan on which faculty need to have an especially strong voice? Why?

3. In general, a key performance indicator (KPI) is a measurable parameter used by an organization to determine how well it is achieving its goals. What are the top three KPIs that should we measure to determine how well we are achieving the goals in the Strategic Plan? Why?

Definition Requests:

Without obsessive word-smithing, please attempt to define the following in a way that is inclusive of all academic programs we offer:

- “comprehensive polytechnic university”
- “learn-by-doing”
- “teacher-scholar”
- “all majors are polytechnic and produce whole-system thinkers”
Quick General Question:

4. What is the most effective way for the WASC-Senate task forces (Teacher-Scholar; Learn-by-Doing; Integration and Student Learning; Strategic Plan) to solicit and obtain faculty input?

Brainstorm Session:

- Email
- Surveys (web-based, e.g. Survey Monkey) – need to be time appropriate, e.g. 5 minutes
- 15 minutes at a department meeting – can discuss one concept or two; give them a “precursor” email (could be Survey Monkey) beforehand so people can be prepared
- Blackboard
- Briefcase function in Zimbra to share documents
- Identify liaisons in each department who may already be working on their department strategic plans
- “Clicker” sessions (live meeting at which people respond to question via a clicker; “ask the audience” approach

Final Recommendation:

- Hybrid approach – Give opportunity for independent thinking by soliciting feedback via web-based survey, e.g. Survey Monkey. Someone from the department presents the results during a department meeting. Give the results in two forms – (1) how the department responded to the survey and (2) how the university as a whole responded to the survey. Provides an opportunity to see the alignment between the department and university. Objective of the survey along with getting independent feedback is for the survey to be a precursor and introduce the topics to be further discussed at the department meeting at which there is discussion in attempt to get additional feedback.

Strategic Plan Questions:

5. What are the three most important issues in the Strategic Plan on which faculty need to have an especially strong voice? Why?

- What is the definition and role of professional development for faculty in relation to the mission of the campus? (What counts as professional development?) Is it enhancing the prestige of the university, is it to provide funds for the university, is it to enhance student learning? How much of a role should professional development play in RPT?

- What is our most important product/customer at our institution? For example, is it knowledge or is it knowledgeable students? How do we strike the balance between individual faculty achievement and student-focus. Is it the faculty or the graduated students who make the reputation of our institution? What do we value?

- Key performance indicators for the strategic plan. Need to be careful of the behavior that key performance indicators can create, so they are not orthogonal to the goal.

Why:

- The faculty and staff are in the trenches with our “product” which is our students. Because of the day-to-day interactions with students, faculty and staff are especially attuned to addressing these issues.

6. In general, a key performance indicator (KPI) is a measurable parameter used by an organization to determine how well it is achieving its goals. What are the top three KPIs that should we measure to determine how well we are achieving the goals in the Strategic Plan? Why?
• Number and availability of jobs and employment rate of graduates
• Student and faculty ratio with the caveat of how do you calculate for faculty that don’t teach full-time.
• Preparedness of our graduates for not only their chosen profession but also as excellent communicators and logical and analytical thinkers with leadership qualities, the ability to think and converse outside of their fields, and cross-cultural competency.
• Salaries of graduates in relation to the cost of their education, e.g. what is a graduate making 5 years into their career in comparison to how much was spent on their education at Cal Poly. How does it compare to other institutions?
• Alumni support of university – not just in dollars, but participation and engagement through gifts, projects, hiring graduates, legacy students, etc.

**Definition Requests:**

Without obsessive word-smithing, please attempt to define the following in a way that is inclusive of all academic programs we offer:

• “comprehensive polytechnic university”

  See KPI #3 – excellent communicators and logical and analytical thinkers with leadership qualities, the ability to think and converse outside of their respective fields, and cross-cultural competency.

• “learn-by-doing”

  Labs, projects, work experience, require small class sizes, maintain close faculty-student interaction

• “all majors are polytechnic and produce whole-system thinkers”

  Acknowledging the intellectual, emotional, and spiritual components of all of us, which are manifestations of our humanity.

• “Teacher-scholar”

  The role of scholarship is to keep faculty engaged in their original field as well as keeping current, keeps “creative juices” flowing, and enhances their job in the classroom. Can bring projects onto campus. There is scholarship in teaching itself and that needs to be acknowledged – to teach is to learn twice.
Quick General Question:

1. What is the most effective way for the WASC-Senate task forces (Teacher-Scholar; Learn-by-Doing; Integration and Student Learning; Strategic Plan) to solicit and obtain faculty input?
   - **Surveys.** Two ways: one more quantitative and one more qualitative. Quantitative: a survey with specific questions testing certain passages. Qualitative: open-ended responses to questions.

Strategic Plan Questions:

2. What are the three most important issues in the Strategic Plan on which faculty need to have an especially strong voice? Why?
   - Teacher-Scholar Model. Everybody has a different definition.
   - All majors are polytechnic.
   - Restoring economically viability.
   - All things that bear directly on faculty.

3. In general, a key performance indicator (KPI) is a measurable parameter used by an organization to determine how well it is achieving its goals. What are the top three KPIs that should we measure to determine how well we are achieving the goals in the Strategic Plan? Why?
   - Teacher-Scholar Model: dollars in funding, number of publications both measure only the scholar side. TSM factor: total dollars x total publications / total SCUs.
   - Student learning. **Weighing brain mass of entering freshmen and comparing it to graduating seniors.**
   - All majors are polytechnic. Comprehensive range of programs. Ratio of A&S to professional or its inverse. Number of programs that require calculus. **P factor: number of math and science credit hours divided by total credit hours in each program**
   - Restoring economic viability: **Student to faculty ratio.**
   - Diversity: **demographics of students and faculty/staff.**

Definition Requests:

Without obsessive word-smithing, please attempt to define the following in a way that is inclusive of all academic programs we offer:

- "comprehensive polytechnic university"
  - Integrated knowledge? Comprehensive modifies polytechnic, or polytechnic modified comprehensive? Comprehensive means breadth of disciplines. Cultural and technical literacy for all majors. **Multi-lingual in a disciplinary sense. Cf. engineering studies.**
- "learn-by-doing"
  - Knowledge is put into the context of relevant experience. To actively practice your discipline. **An authentic performance in the discipline** that reflect the real performance of people with a certain expertise in the world.
- "all majors are polytechnic and produce whole-system thinkers"
Historically, the campus has been defined by a polytechnic "club" to which only a few colleges belonged. All majors are polytechnic means that every major has a place in our identity. Whole system thinkers: STEAM—the arts have their place in STEM. Seeing problems and solutions in contexts. The dam as an example—very good in the narrow sense of making water and power but very bad in terms of the larger ecology. Ecology as an important word. An ecology of knowledge as a model university.
Academic Senate Retreat
Strategic Plan Activity
Table 3

Quick General Question:

1. What is the most effective way for the WASC-Senate task forces (Teacher-Scholar; Learn-by-Doing; Integration and Student Learning; Strategic Plan) to solicit and obtain faculty input?
   - If WASC document already defined teacher/scholar, shouldn't we use this information already, aren't we running in circles?
   - Did the previous collection method used by WASC work or not work? Didn't they collect information already via a vacuum cleaning process?
   - Dedicate time in a department meeting, at least ½ hour
   - Department level is best, not individual, don't go deeper than department
   - Certain departments have PhD track in addition to Practitioner Track, in addition to Scholarship of Teaching
   - Involve the staff in these discussions, best way to get them is through Senators and Senate committees
   - More focus groups, not a vacuum cleaner approach

Strategic Plan Questions:

2. What are the three most important issues in the Strategic Plan on which faculty need to have an especially strong voice? Why?
   - Please include Staff in this question
   - The opposite question is important, what is the LEAST important part, we think saying "Nation's premier comprehensive poly..." seems a bit silly if we are a group of one or two. So what?
   - Should we be trying to attract the BEST THINKERS? Not the best GPA students
   - We need to establish the tracking progress that we are going to use. This is super important because we need to know how we are going to know if we are successful?
   - Economic viability is very important. Without it we cannot function
   - Under the VISION statement, we did not see "How do we view ourselves" we see primarily "How do others view us". The VISION is critical, do we recognize greatness ourselves? What does a great institution look like? What do we want to be?
   - We currently are very, very good, no need to change many things. Perhaps our vision is not to change too much.
   - Can we take any student, not simply the best incoming student, but any student, and can we have them become CAPABLE if they moved through our system.
   - Can we be a MORE AGILE program? This requires money and we need to have a 1:16 student ratio.
   - Resource allocation, resources must be aligned with our expectations towards greatness and thoughtfully distributed
   - Therefore GREATNESS, AGILITY, ECONOMIC STRENGTH

3. In general, a key performance indicator (KPI) is a measurable parameter used by an organization to determine how well it is achieving its goals. What are the top three KPIs that should we measure to determine how well we are achieving the goals in the Strategic Plan? Why?
   - There is a problem with GRADUATION RATE percentages. In Engineering, many students are disqualified, that is a good thing because we don't want to push through everyone, this is a life safety issue
   - A minimum GPA for a department is a good KPI
   - Placement of our students who do graduate is important. They are highly sought after. Another KPI is "how do our grads advance in their careers five to ten years out?"
   - Depth and breadth and quality of individual student experiences must be mapped
   - Are our students happy? Did they have a positive experience here on campus? Could an entrance interview and exit interview be conducted?
   - Do we retain our students? Retention is a good KPI
   - What is the quality of our students' progress? Is the quality of their experience increasing as they move through the curriculum?
   - Publications by faculty, especially with student co-authors! This is a bit dangerous because we need the financial support to
- Faculty retention and retention of professional staff. Is the faculty and professional staff happy and satisfied with their experience? Is the faculty and professional staff diverse?

**Definition Requests:**

Without obsessive word-smithing, please attempt to define the following in a way that is inclusive of all academic programs we offer:

- **“comprehensive polytechnic university”**

  A polytechnic links theory to practice. There must be a hands-on aspect to the school. It is akin to a TRADE SCHOOL, or a VOCATIONAL SCHOOL. It is a place where you are trained (hands on) and you learn skills. In Europe, the level of intellectual skills is lower than here. Here polytechnic means thinking and doing. We are training professionals. We come here because it is career oriented or profession oriented. This is not necessarily a training for a specific trade. One big hurdle is that we admit them into a major as Freshman, this contributes to a TRADE SCHOOL mentality. This creates huge problems in the definition of Teacher/Scholar. A polytechnic must mean that students are trained to gain knowledge outside their specialty. In Europe, a lot of GE is done prior to entering the polytechnic, and a polytechnic is an elite institution, not a typical university. In Africa, a polytechnic is lower in prestige than a typical university. So we might want to focus on breadth and depth a T shaped person. We need to emphasize the horizontal part of the T, not just the deep teeth. Why is philosophy important at a polytechnic? What is it about the science of philosophy that is of value to all? The master's degree is important it is part of our identity now. For an engineer, the polytechnic experience is pretty easy to explain. But what about an Art Major at Cal Poly? What does a polytechnic mean to him/her? Perhaps they can apply chemistry, physics etc that can inform their art and provide linkages that students studying Art at an art school might never have. Students sitting in a class outside their major should not ask “Why am I taking this course?” they should ask “how can this course help me in my major?” This is summarized as an INTENTIONAL EXPERIENCE. It is our intention to have engineers connect somehow to liberal arts and vice versa, but we should emphasize the intentionality. Becoming an intellectual is one of the missions of a comprehensive polytechnic. Could there be more coherence across GEs and GEs to MAJORS, either by mapping learning outcomes or emphasizing intentionality.

- **“learn-by-doing”**

  Linking theory to practice it is so much more than hands-on. It is not simply flowing from theory to practice, it has to be circular, practice must spin back to theory, what we learn in the lab/classroom colors what we learn in the world. Learning to do something by actually doing it, there is a trial and error atmosphere and provides an opportunity for students to BE TAUGHT not simply to learn. A learn by doing atmosphere allows students to be taught. Studio environment is an excellent model for this, students being guided by a mentor, yet they are allowed to experiment, fail and then ultimately learn. The mentor is really guiding the students who is really a coach. The students are going to actually do it. But how about a course in differential equations? They won't get there by trial and error, yet we can still guide them in a varied experiential setting. Give them opportunity to practice thinking out loud, let them reflect and speak and intellectually experience things in a vibrant setting. Can they defend their position and argue intellectually? Can we do by learning? Can we Learn by Thinking! Learn by thinking is Philosophy, not learning a trade.

- **“all majors are polytechnic and produce whole-system thinkers”**

  Destroy the myth that polytechnic is solely the purview of engineering and architecture. Take Art for example, they are hands-on, they are creative. Musicians can also use physics to better understand their craft. This leads to a whole-systems thinker: we don’t want students to be fed, we want them to get to the point of using concepts not simply reiterating facts and formulas. The whole system thinker is actually a big part of our vision. In every polytechnic, the base line of a career professional comes from STEM proficiency. How can engineering exist without science and math? Yet science and math can exist without engineering! So they provide pieces of a bigger picture. The word “Comprehensive Polytechnic” itself is controversial, can it be “TECHNIC” means CRAFT. Polytechnic means MANY CRAFTS. Go back to Greek definition. We cannot change our name and we suspect that the word “comprehensive” is duct-taped on to POLYTECHNIC to satisfy a whole bunch of constituencies. A whole system thinker who does “learn by doing and learn by thinking” A T SHAPED individual expresses the intersection of Learn by Doing and Learn by Thinking”

- **Teacher/Scholar**

  Teachers who are involved in discipline specific intellectual pursuits, but then link it back into their teaching. This is the scholarship of discovery and the scholarship of teaching. Don’t reduce the word scholar to a narrow view of research.
Scholarship means growing in your discipline. This definition also applies to professional staff as well, yet they would have to link it to their work, perhaps use lower case "t" in teacher/scholar. Everybody on this campus has an impact on our students, even the housekeepers.
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Quick General Question:

1. What is the most effective way for the WASC-Senate task forces (Teacher-Scholar; Learn-by-Doing; Integration and Student Learning; Strategic Plan) to solicit and obtain faculty input?
   - Email.
   - A face-to-face meeting involving food and possibly drinks include at least two committee members or a tape recorder

Strategic Plan Questions:

2. What are the three most important issues in the Strategic Plan on which faculty need to have an especially strong voice? Why?
   - Creating an achievable vision statement because the current vision is unrealistic.
   - Connecting resources to vision and identity because if something is not economically viable, it is not attainable.
   - Teacher Scholar Model because it has little presence in the current plan and is increasingly being inserted into the RPT process either implicitly or explicitly.

3. In general, a key performance indicator (KPI) is a measurable parameter used by an organization to determine how well it is achieving its goals. What are the top three KPIs that should we measure to determine how well we are achieving the goals in the Strategic Plan? Why?
   - Employment rate at graduation and salary and position at 10 years out.
   - Alumni satisfaction i.e., would you choose Cal Poly again, would you recommend Cal Poly to others, would you encourage your children to attend Cal Poly
   - Ratio of money brought in vs. money spent in Advancement

Definition Requests:

Without obsessive word-smithing, please attempt to define the following in a way that is inclusive of all academic programs we offer:

- "comprehensive polytechnic university"
  we accept the Carnegie analysis given in the strategic plan

- "learn-by-doing"
  endorse definition in WASC CPR

- "all majors are polytechnic and produce whole-system thinkers"
  without consensus we endorse as defined on page 16 of the strategic plan

- "teacher scholar model"
  we endorse the definition given on Administrative Bulletin 85-2 dated February 22, 1985 (page 3)
Quick General Question:

1. What is the most effective way for the WASC-Senate task forces (Teacher-Scholar; Learn-by-Doing; Integration and Student Learning; Strategic Plan) to solicit and obtain faculty input?
   - Electronic surveys, directed department discussion and the Senate floor

Strategic Plan Questions:

2. What are the three most important issues in the Strategic Plan on which faculty need to have an especially strong voice? Why?
   - Curriculum continue to be under faculty control- most closely associated with the student educational needs
   - Allocation of resources—faculty retention for departmental research and teaching
   - Faculty need to have a strong voice in what professional development is
   - Alignment between faculty and administration goals for the University- cover the “What are the gaps between our vision, mission, and our current position” situation
   - Program and assessment need to be very carefully tied to what it means to “implement institution-wide vision-driven and evidence-based decision-making and continuous improvement”

3. In general, a key performance indicator (KPI) is a measurable parameter used by an organization to determine how well it is achieving its goals. What are the top three KPIs that should we measure to determine how well we are achieving the goals in the Strategic Plan? Why?
   - Job placement rate
   - Measures of graduation success against other peer universities.
   - Cost to degree
   - Student functionality 6 months post-hire

Definition Requests:

Without obsessive word-smithing, please attempt to define the following in a way that is inclusive of all academic programs we offer:

- “comprehensive polytechnic university”
  All students have technical exposure prior to graduation and they have to have comprehensive liberal arts exposure.
  Two definitions that need to be conjoined or make it “comprehensive, polytechnic university”

- “learn-by-doing”
  Is the core of our polytechnic identity

- “teacher-scholar”

- “all majors are polytechnic and produce whole-system thinkers”
  All majors support the polytechnic vision and thereby produce whole-system thinkers
Academic Senate Retreat
Strategic Plan Activity
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Quick General Question:

1. What is the most effective way for the WASC-Senate task forces (Teacher-Scholar; Learn-by-Doing; Integration and Student Learning; Strategic Plan) to solicit and obtain faculty input?
   - Be specific in the issue/question asked (i.e. no open-ended ideas veiled in the premise of “what do you think...”)  
   - Define it first to then lead to strengthening/challenging ideas
   - Individualize at grassroots level – send members to departments/colleges to gauge/solicit input

Strategic Plan Questions:

2. What are the three most important issues in the Strategic Plan on which faculty need to have an especially strong voice? Why?
   - Role and measurement of research productivity in RTP; Teacher/Scholar – where does service rank within this model... Where is Teacher/Scholar/Citizen within this definition?
   - What specific direction does the vision statement do in terms of moving us forward; what does it mean for the future in terms of action items; form & function
   - Understand the realistic and the constraining aspects of the teacher/scholar definition
   - Demands of Learn by Doing on individual course delivery – how does that definition trickle down from university, college, department, program and course.

3. In general, a key performance indicator (KPI) is a measurable parameter used by an organization to determine how well it is achieving its goals. What are the top three KPIs that should we measure to determine how well we are achieving the goals in the Strategic Plan? Why?
   - Ranking and Program recognition – premier is embedded in vision
   - Quality of graduates – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills; our vision is founded in the “products” we deliver. Also, making sure that assessment isn’t painting us into a “No Child Left Behind” corner; not simply about an objective test/skill set. Measure of quality also based upon their career beyond the ephemeral (employers 5, 10, 15 years out).
   - Quality of faculty and facilities – proof is in the resources to produce the vision

Definition Requests:

Without obsessive word-smithing, please attempt to define the following in a way that is inclusive of all academic programs we offer:

- “comprehensive polytechnic university”

Knowledgeable across divisions – multilingual in disciplines of learning, a comprehensive polytechnic university is defined as specialized disciplines collaborating together to produce students balanced in the technical, humanities and scientific fields with an eye toward graduating creators and innovators versus employees and workers.

- “learn-by-doing”

Learn-by-doing is the initiation of theory into practice – emphasizing the creation of teaching environments geared toward providing students with varying skills sets in “real” life and “real” career application.

- “teacher/scholar”

Teacher/Scholars are professors, pushing the envelope of knowledge, who continue to learn and produce work within their fields with a sense of quality reciprocity towards enhancing student/course learning.
"all majors are polytechnic and produce whole-system thinkers"

How about all majors are COMPREHENSIVE polytechnic...thus see above

Or

Every Cal Poly student should be balanced in the technical, humanities and scientific fields.
Quick General Question:

1. What is the most effective way for the WASC-Senate task forces (Teacher-Scholar; Learn-by-Doing; Integration and Student Learning; Strategic Plan) to solicit and obtain faculty input?
   - The most beneficial information can be obtained by focus groups rather than surveys. (With the following caveat, that decisions will be made if faculty do not provide input.) Send members of the task force into department meetings.

Strategic Plan Questions:

2. What are the three most important issues in the Strategic Plan on which faculty need to have an especially strong voice? Why?
   - Assessment – Faculty are those who know best about what is happening in the classroom and how to assess performance and outcomes. Graduation is too gross and simplistic to be an effective indicator. Assessment should occur on multiple levels. Programs that have external accreditation will include that data as well. Faculty should be able to propose and implement assessment tools from the grass roots rather than a top-down approach to assessment.
   - Teacher Scholar Model – Developing an institution that promotes and sustains the teacher-scholar model. (Clear definition about what scholarship is at Cal Poly across different colleges and departments.)
   - Vision – Role of faculty in developing vision.
   - Decisions – Is there a place for faculty in the decisions. More specifically, faculty input on how decisions regarding budgets and allocation are made.

3. In general, a key performance indicator (KPI) is a measurable parameter used by an organization to determine how well it is achieving its goals. What are the top three KPIs that should we measure to determine how well we are achieving the goals in the Strategic Plan? Why?
   - Tracking of ratio of housing costs to median faculty salary, private universities, community college—issue of retention and attraction of quality faculty. Question of spousal hires and how that affects hiring new faculty.
   - KPI for faculty excellence – faculty production, patents, etc.
   - KPI for advising effectiveness and benefits
   - Areas that emphasize education (single and multi subject) – how many are in education and of those how many in California.

Definition Requests:

Without obsessive word-smithing, please attempt to define the following in a way that is inclusive of all academic programs we offer:

- “comprehensive polytechnic university”
  Every professional student will have a balance of arts, sciences, and humanities; every arts, sciences, and humanities student will have a balance of professional programs.

- “teacher scholar”
  Faculty who embrace active participation in both teaching and scholarship; meaningful student engagement in faculty scholarly activities; inclusion of scholarship in teaching to create vibrant learning experiences for students.

- “learn-by-doing”
  Synthetic endeavor combining applied and conceptual learning.

- “all majors are polytechnic and produce whole-system thinkers”
  True.
Quick General Question:

1. What is the most effective way for the WASC-Senate task forces (Teacher-Scholar; Learn-by-Doing; Integration and Student Learning; Strategic Plan) to solicit and obtain faculty input?
   - Wiki for faculty to access
   - Department Chairs – solicit faculty input
   - Survey
   - Open Forum
   - Focus group (in person or Elluminate)

Strategic Plan Questions:

2. What are the three most important issues in the Strategic Plan on which faculty need to have an especially strong voice? Why?
   - Gaining specificity in definition of “comprehensive polytechnic” and “premier”.
   - Can each faculty member and staff find a way to contribute to the review process?
   - Address the issue of whether or not every major should be “Polytechnic”

3. In general, a key performance indicator (KPI) is a measurable parameter used by an organization to determine how well it is achieving its goals. What are the top three KPIs that should we measure to determine how well we are achieving the goals in the Strategic Plan? Why?
   - Goal: Increase Integration and interlinking...
     Measure cross disciplinary work – number of students doing cross disciplinary projects / Faculty appointments in multiple colleges
   - Goal: Build on a core Learn...
     Track job placement – survey alumni
   - Goal: Adopt and implement comprehensive enrollment management
     Variance of enrollment

Definition Requests:

Without obsessive word-smithing, please attempt to define the following in a way that is inclusive of all academic programs we offer:

- “comprehensive polytechnic university” (aspirational)
  
  Historical emphasis in technical fields – currently inclusive of humanities and other fields - Unrealized potential of integrating across disciplines

- “learn-by-doing”

  Provide learning environment that combines practical challenges and theory to prepare graduates to be immediately contributing members of their profession and community.

- “all majors are polytechnic and produce whole-system thinkers”

  We do not believe that all departments are polytechnic given that we are a comprehensive polytechnic.

- Teacher Scholar
Balance between teaching and scholarship
A model which allows faculty to engage in activities which enhance the learning environment of students.
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
Tuesday, October 5 2010
UU 220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: None.

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

III. Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair: (Fernflores) The Chair gave a PowerPoint presentation as introduction to new senators re Senate processes: duties of Senate officers, staff, caucus chairs, and senators; first and second readings of resolutions; Senate attendance requirements; etc. She also reviewed new procedures for curriculum appeals. The Chair summarized several matters that will come before the Senate this academic year.

B. President’s Office: (Howard-Greene) The search for a new President is underway. Campus forums with the finalists are anticipated for the week of November 29. Appointment of a new President is expected to be made before the end of the calendar year. Dan Howard-Greene announced his retirement at the end of December. He will be greatly missed.

C. Provost: (Koob) The budget news is good. $106m was received in one-time restoration funds; however, there is an expectation by the Chancellor’s Office that the money will be used to increase admissions. We have received about 500 transfer student applications. About 25% are eligible. About 50 new students will be admitted at the beginning of winter quarter.


E. Statewide Senate: (Foroohar) Several resolutions are already before the Academic Senate CSU this academic year. (LoCascio) The statewide Academic Affairs Committee is looking at two issues: [1] dual degrees, and [2] on-campus mental health assistance for returning veteran students.

F. CFA Campus President: (Thorncroft) Governor Schwarzenegger has vetoed SB 330. This bill would have required foundations and other auxiliary non-profits connected with the State's public universities and colleges to make their handling of money and other operations more transparent and accountable to the public.

G. ASI Representative: (Storelli) ASI President, Sarah Storelli, introduced herself and ASI Board of Director Chair, Natalia Walicki. ASI is close to its goal of registering 10% of students to vote. The deadline is October 18. Cal Poly is well ahead of other campuses.

H. Committee and Caucus Chairs: None.

IV. Special Report(s):

Jim Keese, Academic Senate representative to the Academic Council for International Programs (ACIP), gave a PowerPoint presentation on CSU International Programs (IP). This is a one year program for students to study abroad in one of 16 countries. Cal Poly has 69 students enrolled for 2010-2011, the third largest enrollment in the CSU. Programs are available for students in all majors.
Consent Agenda:
The following curriculum proposals were approved by consent:
ASCI/BIO/BMED 593 Stem Cell Research Internship (S) supv
ASCI/BIO/BMED 594 Applications in Stem Cell Research (2) 1 sem, and supv
BIO 534 Principles of Stem Cell Biology (2) 2 sem
CPE/EE 133 Digital Design (4) 3 lec, 1 lab
CPE/EE 233 Computer Design and Assembly Language Programming (4) 3 lec, 1 lab
GSB 573 Marketing Research (4) 4 lec
Stem Cell Research Specialization, MS Biomedical Engineering
Stem Cell Research Specialization, MS Biological Sciences

VI. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Clarifying Academic Program and Institutional Assessment: First reading. The Chair introduced the resolution and summarized its recommendations. The Academic Senate will oversee university-level assessment. Faculty involved in assessment activities may report such service as an appropriate form of teaching, scholarship, or service. Resolution will return as a second reading item.
B. Resolution on Academic Senate Operating Procedures for Its Committees: First reading. The current operating procedures for Academic Senate committees are outdated. In addition, there is no bylaws provision allowing electronic communications for committee deliberations. This resolution recommends procedures for physical and electronic meetings. Resolution will return as a second reading item.
C. Resolution on Modification to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate to Allow for Electronic Voting: First reading. This resolution allows both paper and electronic elections to be used by the Academic Senate. Resolution will return as a second reading item.
D. Resolution on Modification to Academic Program Review Procedures: First reading. When program review moved from the Academic Senate to Academic Programs, the Executive Committee retained its position as final approver for a program’s internal reviewer. This step has not provided value-added oversight and often delays the start of a review. The resolution eliminates the Executive Committee’s role of approving internal reviewers but adds a provision for annual summaries to the Academic Senate on the findings of academic programs that underwent review in that year. Resolution will return as a second reading item.

VII. Discussion Item(s):

VIII. Adjournment: 4:43pm

Prepared by:

Margaret Camuso
Academic Senate
I. Minutes: none.

II. Communications and Announcements: none.

III. Regular Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: Fernflores announced a request from the CSU to nominate faculty for the CSU Faculty Trustee position. The faculty trustee’s work is very important to the university. The CSU has not had a representative since 2009. Update on WASC Task Forces: (a) Integration and Student Learning – had free-form discussions and now members are working together on the content of their resolution (b) Strategic Plan – has an outline for their resolution but want more campus feedback (c) Teacher-Scholar – has started writing their resolution and have general agreement on how to proceed.

B. President’s Office: Howard-Greene reported that the Presidential search is under way following the same protocol as last spring. The Search Committee and Campus Advisory Committee met last week to peruse applications. It is expected that the identity of the candidates will be known before the Thanksgiving Holiday.

C. Provost’s Office: Koob announced that Cal Poly has received its 2010-2011 budget allocations from the CSU. Cal Poly’s enrollment target was increased to 16,463 FTES, an increase of 4.9% over the initial target of 15,702 FTES. The good news is that there is enough funding for some restoration and to assure that no layoffs will take place. The Sustain Project – there is interest in creating a project-based learning program on the campus. Participants must follow Academic Senate and university rules on how courses are approved for registration. Nothing has been decided at this time.

D. Vice President for Student Affairs: Morton announced that Jenna Bush-Hager will be the first speaker in this year’s Provocative Perspective series of talks. The talk starts at 8:00 am on Thursday, November 18. The Division of Student Affairs has been instrumental over the last years in sponsoring this event.

E. Statewide Senators: none.

F. CFA Campus President: Thomcroft reported that bargaining is a very unstable process and recently faculty eligible for equity increase received about 1/7 of what they would have received.

G. ASI: Walicki reported that the UU Advisory Board is working on obtaining feedback from faculty and students about what they would like to see in the new Rec Center.

H. Committee Chair(s): Stephens reported on the timeline to fill the position of Assistant Vice Provost for University Advising. Applications are being reviewed until November 22, phone interviews will take place January 13 to the 20, and on-campus interviews from January 27 to February 10.

IV. Special Report:
V. Consent Agenda: The following courses were approved: CPR 509 Professional Development, CSC/CPA 105 Fundamentals of Computer Science, and MU 328 Women in Music.

VI. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Academic Assessment at the Program and University Levels (Fernflores/Giberti/Keesey):
   Fernflores, Academic Senate chair, presented this resolution, which addresses program and university assessment, not individual courses, as a way of assessing whether collective efforts are working. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

B. Resolution on Academic Senate Operating Procedures for its Committees (Executive Committee):
   Fernflores, Academic Senate chair, presented this resolution, which states that modifications to sections VIII.D and VIII.E of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate supersede AS-306-89 “Resolution to Provide a Generic Set of Operating Procedures for Academic Senate Standing and Ad Hoc Committees” M/S/P to postpone discussion.

C. Resolution on Modification to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate to Allow for Electronic Voting (Executive Committee): Fernflores, Academic Senate chair, presented this resolution, which modifies sections III.A and III.A.5 of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate to allow for electronic voting. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

D. Resolution on Modification to Academic Program Review Procedures (Executive Committee):
   Fernflores, Academic Senate chair, presented this resolution, which removes the Academic Senate Executive Committee as the final approving body of internal reviewers for academic programs reviews. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

E. Resolution on Initiatives in Conflict with Cal Poly Mission Statement (Executive Committee):
   Fernflores, Academic Senate chair, presented this resolution, which proposes a process for faculty to have complaints heard about initiatives perceived to be in conflict with the Cal Poly Mission Statement. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

F. Resolution on Academic Senate Fairness Board Description and Procedures (Executive Committee):
   Shapiro, Fairness Board member, presented this resolution, which requests that the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the revised Fairness Board Description and Procedures. Resolution will return as a second reading item.

G. Resolution on Academic Dishonesty: Cheating and Plagiarism Procedures (Executive Committee):
   Fernflores, Academic Senate chair, presented this resolution, which requests that the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the revised Academic Dishonesty: Cheating and Plagiarism. Resolution will return as a second reading item.

VII. Discussion Item: none.

VIII. Adjournment: meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

Submitted by,

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
WHEREAS, The current set of operating procedures for Academic Senate standing and ad hoc committees was adopted in 1989 as Resolution AS-306-89 (attached); and

WHEREAS, The procedures outlined in AS-306-89 contain outdated information; and

WHEREAS, New operating procedures are needed that conform to changes made to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, Section VIII.D "Operating Procedures" and to acknowledge the widespread use of electronic communications for committee deliberations; and

WHEREAS, Confusion over the definition of "meeting" has occurred due to the widespread use of electronic communications for committee deliberations, and providing a definition of "meeting" will improve the reading of bylaws section VIII.D, "Operating Procedures"; and

WHEREAS, Robert's Rules of Order 10th edition requires that efforts to conduct the deliberative process by asynchronous means (not all at the same time) must be expressly authorized by the organization's bylaws and supported by standing rules since many procedures common to parliamentary law are not applicable; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That Academic Resolution AS-306-89, "Resolution to Provide a Generic Set of Operating Procedures for Academic Senate Standing and Ad Hoc Committees" be repealed; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the operating procedures appearing in section VIII.D of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate supersede AS-306-89; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached modifications to sections VIII.D and VIII.E of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be adopted by the Academic Senate of Cal Poly.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: September 21 2010
Revised: October 19 2010
Revised: November 2 2010
Revised: November 9 2010
Bylaws of the Academic Senate

VIII.D. [COMMITTEES:] OPERATING PROCEDURES

Operating procedures for Academic Senate standing and ad hoc committees are as follows:

A committee meeting is defined as a deliberative gathering of individuals—either physically or electronically, as appropriate—for the purpose of reviewing, discussing, or deciding on matters assigned by the Academic Senate Executive Committee. Electronic meetings are appropriate where simple, straightforward decisions can be considered. They do not lend themselves to items that need detailed discussion and the exploration of options.

Meetings shall be called at the discretion of the committee 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.

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.

VIII.D.1 Physical Meetings
1. A simple majority (51%) 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.

VIII.D.2 Electronic Meetings (e-meetings and e-consultations)
1. A simple majority (51%) of the voting members shall constitute a quorum for an e-meeting. A quorum is required to conduct business.
2. The decision to use an e-meeting should be made with due regard to the nature of the work to be undertaken. If a member of the committee objects to the use of an e-meeting for a particular business item, then the committee shall discuss that matter at a physical meeting.
3. A variety of technologies may be adopted as available, subject to the needs of the meeting and compliance with these procedures. No special requirements should be imposed on members other than having suitable access to meeting communications and documents.
4. Committee e-meetings are open to the public and when a member of the public wishes to attend, the committee shall make reasonable efforts to accommodate the attendance of that person.

5. A vote by the majority of the voting members of the committee shall be the decision of the committee.

6. The chair of the committee shall:
   a. Control the committee’s flow of business
   b. Maintain a current list of members
   c. Provide a notice of meeting with agenda and instructions for members about what is required (e.g., “members are asked to read and consider each item in the agenda, then [vote, comment, recommend, etc.]”). Notice shall include a timeline for discussion and action
   d. Members shall respond to the notice of meeting indicating their presence
   e. The committee chair shall prepare a final record of each meeting (minutes) and transmit a copy to the Academic Senate office

VIII.E. MEETINGS OPEN TO PUBLIC

Physical and electronic meetings of all committees, except those dealing with confidential and/or personnel matters of individuals, shall be open. The time, place, and manner and place of each meeting shall be announced in advance.
Background statement: The Academic Senate bylaws specify that each committee shall have written operating procedures on file in the office of the Academic Senate. These are to be reviewed by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is proposing this set of generic operating procedures to assist committees in meeting this requirement. It could be accepted as a blanket procedure unless a committee prefers to draft its own. This draft was accepted unanimously by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee in January 1988 and affirmed by a vote of 6-0 on October 11, 1988. Vacant membership on the committee included SAED, SSM, and ASI.

AS-306-89/C&BC

RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE A GENERIC SET OF OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC SENATE STANDING AND AD HOC COMMITTEES

WHEREAS, Article VII Section D of the Academic Senate bylaws specify each committee shall have a written set of operating procedures on file in the Senate office; and

WHEREAS, A generic set of procedures will be acceptable to many committees; and

WHEREAS, Any committee requiring greater detail and specificity in operation can propose and have them accepted; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the generic operating procedures for Academic Senate committees (attached) be accepted.

Proposed By:
Constitution and Bylaws Committee
November 1, 1988
Revised January 10, 1989
OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES

The committees of the Academic Senate, both standing and ad hoc, in compliance with Article VII, Section D, of the bylaws must have an approved set of operating procedures on file in the office of the Academic Senate. Excepting elected committees which must have specific operating procedures approved by the Senate, committees may elect to be governed by these procedures or must develop and submit for approval the procedures they will employ in the conduct of their charges.

1. A simple majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum for a meeting. A quorum is required to conduct business.

2. Chairpersons shall be elected by the majority vote at the first meeting of the academic year called by the Chair of the Senate. Chairpersons serve until the end of the academic year. In the event that a chairperson must miss a meeting, the chairperson shall appoint a substitute chairperson for that meeting.

3. Meetings shall be called at the discretion of the chairperson 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 chairperson at least three (3) working days before the meeting date. Committees may establish regular meeting times. Upon committee agreement, a regular meeting time shall constitute notice. Decisions made at meetings may not be challenged for lack of proper notice either if all members attend or if all sign statements waiving the notice requirement.

5. Decisions of the committee must be made at meetings in which the attending members are in simultaneous communication with each other. This excludes telephone polling of members unless accomplished with conference phone with all members included.

6. Members may not vote by proxy.

7. A vote by the majority of the voting members attending a meeting shall be the decision of the committee.

8. Voting shall take place by a show of hands unless one attending member requests a secret ballot. The record shall show the resulting vote.

9. A committee report explaining the decision and noting the vote leading to the decision of the committee shall be filed at the Academic Senate office. Minority reports also may be filed with that office.
WHEREAS, The 2007-2008 Academic Senate Chair gave an interim charge to the Research & Professional Development Committee to “hear complaints from faculty about initiatives that are perceived to be in conflict with Cal Poly’s Mission Statement”; and

WHEREAS, In spring, 2010, the Research & Professional Development Committee reported in its committee procedures that the Academic Senate needs “to find a more permanent way to resolve such concerns” due to the increased workload this would place on the committee; and

WHEREAS, Perceived conflicts with the Cal Poly Mission Statement could cover a range of issues, including, but not limited to, curriculum, faculty affairs, instruction, research; and

WHEREAS, A broad-based committee would provide a more inclusive perspective to deliberations of perceived conflicts; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the following procedure be adopted by the Academic Senate for Cal Poly:

When a proposed initiative is perceived to be in conflict with the Cal Poly Mission Statement, the matter will be documented by a senator who will bring the documentation forward to the Academic Senate Chair. The Academic Senate Chair will engage in consultative practices with the appropriate parties to determine if the proposed initiative needs to come to the Academic Senate Executive Committee for its consideration. If the Academic Senate Executive Committee determines that the matter is deserving of serious consideration, then the Academic Senate Executive Committee will form an ad hoc committee, comprised of chairs of all Academic Senate standing committees to deliberate the matter. The ad hoc committee will report its findings to the Executive Committee, and the Executive Committee will determine if such findings should be forwarded to the Academic Senate, in the form of a resolution, for further deliberation. If the resolution is adopted by the Academic Senate, it shall be forwarded to the University President for her/his approval in keeping with the Bylaws of the Academic Senate.
RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC SENATE FAIRNESS BOARD DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES

1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the attached *Fairness Board Description and Procedures.*

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: October 5 2010
Revised: October 26 2010
Revised: November 9 2010
FAIRNESS BOARD DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES

Description
The Fairness Board (hereafter called the "Board") is one of the primary campus groups concerned with providing "due process" of academically related matters for students and instructors at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, particularly in terms of student/faculty grading relationships. The Board hears grade appeals based on the grievant's belief that the instructor has made a mistake, shown bad faith or incompetence, or been unfair. Issues of cheating, dishonesty, and plagiarism are addressed by the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR). Grades received due to cheating, dishonesty, and/or plagiarism cannot be appealed to the Board.

In grade appeals, the Board operates under the presumption that the grade assigned was correct. The grievant must prove otherwise by a preponderance of the evidence; in other words, the grievant must show that her/his version of the events is more likely than not (equal to or greater than 51 percent probability) to have occurred. Should the Board's members find in favor of the grievant, the chair will recommend to the Provost that the grade be changed. In all cases, the Board's authority is limited to actions consistent with campus and system policy.

A student who submits a grievance cannot receive a grade lower than the one originally assigned.

In addition to grade grievances, the Board may hear grievances that do not involve grade appeals and are not covered by existing policies administered by other University offices.

Procedures
A. The first and most often successful opportunity for resolving a grade dispute occurs at the department level. Before initiating a grievance with the Board, the student should first make an informal request for redress to the course instructor. If a resolution cannot be reached, such request can then be made to the instructor's department chair/head. If resolution cannot be made at these levels, then later involvement by the Dean of Students may occur.

Any student who still feels aggrieved after requesting relief from both the instructor and instructor's department chair/head may initiate an appeal for redress by writing to the chair of the Board. The Board chair may counsel a student as to the relative merit of the case but must accept all written complaints which are ultimately submitted. The written request shall be in letter form. A copy of Fairness Board Description and Procedures can be
obtained from the Board Academic Senate website at http://academicsenate.calpoly.edu or the student may request a copy from the Board chair.

The student's letter should contain all pertinent details of the situation, including the name of the course, section, instructor, term in question, any witnesses to be called, and the redress sought. All relevant documents should be included as attachments, including items such as a course grade determination handout, exams, papers, letters of support, etc. The student has the responsibility of identifying evidence to overcome the Board's presumption that the instructor's action was correct. As a resource, the Board may request any pertinent documentation (historic or current) from the OSRR. It is noted that decisions of the OSRR are informational and nonbinding.

Within two weeks of receiving a written request, the Board chair will schedule a meeting of the Board on the earliest feasible date to determine if the case may have merit. If the Board decides that the case lacks merit, then the Board chair will forward to the student, within two working days, notice that no further action will be taken unless the student rebuts with new evidence. If the Board decides that the case may have merit, then the following actions will take place:

1. Within two working days, the Board chair will forward a copy of the student grievance letter to the challenged party and request her/his written reply to the Board chair within one week. The Board chair will share a copy of any reply with the student grievant. The Board chair will also send a copy of Fairness Board Description and Procedures to the challenged party.
2. The Board chair will coordinate with the Academic Senate office to make scheduling arrangements for the hearing which will take place within two weeks of the Board's deciding that the case may have merit, and will be conducted informally. At least six Board members must be present before a hearing may begin, and the same six members must be present for the full hearing.
3. When a hearing is scheduled, the Board chair will immediately notify (through the Academic Senate office) the Board members and the two principal parties.
4. Board members will recuse themselves from participation in any case if they are a principal party in the grievance or if they feel they cannot be impartial.
5. The Board will allow each principal party to be accompanied to the hearing by a supportive advocate (a supportive advocate is not to be an attorney or legal advisor, per Academic Senate resolution AS-655-07), call and question witnesses, and present exhibits. The Board may ask for copies of any material it believes relevant to the hearing. The student grievant will usually appear first. Each Board
member may ask questions of either party or any witness. The Board itself may call or recall witnesses. The Board will handle all proceedings without undue delay, will keep a summary file of each case, and will record the hearing. The Board will close the hearing when satisfied that both sides have been fully heard.

6. In the event the student fails to appear at the scheduled hearing, the Board may dismiss the case.

7. Within two weeks after the hearing has been closed, the Board will deliberate in private and will make a written summarization of the facts of the case and of the Board's reasoning in its recommendation to the Provost and the Chair of the Academic Senate.

8. The Board chair will send a copy of its recommendation to each principal party, to the instructor's department, and to each Board member.

9. Should any Board member(s) desire to file a minority recommendation, it will be attached to the Board's majority recommendation.

10. Within two weeks after receiving the Board's recommendation, the Provost will inform the Board and each principal party what action, if any, has been taken. The Provost shall have final authority regarding any change of grade with the provision, however, that no grade change will be made unless it is recommended by the Board. If the recommendation of the Board is not accepted, the Provost shall indicate the reason(s) why in writing to the Board.

B. The hearings are closed to all persons except the Board and the two principal parties and advisors. Witnesses, if any, shall be present only when testifying. No testimony shall be taken outside the hearing room, but written statements from persons unable to attend are admissible.

C. Students should ideally initiate any grade complaint within one quarter as instructors are obligated to retain evaluation instruments (other than those for which there was an announced opportunity for students to retrieve) for only one quarter (Academic Senate resolution AS-247-87). However, the Board will accept grievances for two quarters after an evaluation. If special circumstances exist, such as when an instructor is on leave and not available to the student, the Board may choose to entertain grievances involving grades issued more than two quarters earlier.

D. In the event a situation arises wherein the Board unanimously deems the above rules inappropriate, the Board will modify its procedures to ensure that fairness prevails. Furthermore, exceptions to these rules are possible if the Board and both principal parties have no objections.

E. In accordance with Executive Order 1037, at the end of every academic year, the Board chair shall report, in writing, to the Academic Senate Chair
and the President the number of cases heard during that academic year and the disposition of each such case. A copy of this report shall also be filed annually with the University Registrar so that it is available for review during the student records and registration audit.

Membership
One tenured or probationary faculty member from each college and Professional Consultative Services (PCS) shall be appointed to the Board by the Academic Senate Chair for two-year terms. Ex officio members are the Vice President for Student Affairs or designee, and two student members selected by ASI, with no less than junior standing and three consecutive quarters of attendance at Cal Poly preceding appointment. The Board chair shall be a member of the General Faculty and shall be appointed in accordance with Article VIII.C of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate.
FAIRNESS BOARD DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES

ACADEMIC SENATE FAIRNESS BOARD PROCESS

Unresolved problem exists between student and University

↓

Student makes informal request for redress of problem with instructor of record; if unresolved:

↓

Student makes informal request for redress of problem with instructor's department chair/head and possible involvement of Dean of Students; if unresolved:

↓

Student may consult with chair of the Fairness Board on relative merit of case; if unresolved:

↓

Student initiates appeal for redress by submission of written letter to Board chair. The letter should:

(a) Identify the course name, section, term, and instructor
(b) State complaint and redress sought
(c) Indicate witnesses that may be called
(d) Summarize the efforts to resolve the problem with instructor and department
(e) Include copies of relevant documents such as course grade determination handout, exams, papers, statements of support made by others, etc.

↓

Within two weeks of Board chair's receipt of receiving student’s letter, the Board chair schedules meeting of Fairness Board at earliest feasible date. Fairness Board reviews complaint and determines if case declares that case:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAY HAVE MERIT</th>
<th>LACKS MERIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board requests written response from instructor (within a week) and schedules a hearing for the earliest feasible date (within two weeks). If a resolution to the problem presents itself, the hearing may be terminated. If no resolution seems satisfactory to the Board and the principal parties, the hearing will lead to the Board making recommendation to the Provost (within two weeks).</td>
<td>Within two working days of determination, Board chair notifies student no further action will be taken unless: Student rebuts with new evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MERIT

NO MERIT
FAIRNESS BOARD DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES

ACADEMIC SENATE FAIRNESS BOARD PROCESS

Unresolved problem exists between student and University →

Student makes informal request for redress of problem with instructor of record; if unresolved →

Student makes informal request for redress of problem with instructor's department chair/head and possible involvement of Dean of Students; if unresolved →

Student may consult with chair of the Fairness Board on relative merit of case; if unresolved →

Student initiates appeal for redress by submission of written letter to Board chair. The letter should:

(a) Identify the course name, section, term, and instructor
(b) State complaint and redress sought
(c) Indicate witnesses that may be called
(d) Summarize the efforts to resolve the problem with instructor and department
(e) Include copies of relevant documents such as course grade determination handout, exams, papers, statements of support made by others, etc.

Within two weeks of Board chair's receipt of student's letter, Fairness Board reviews complaint and determines if case:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAY HAVE MERIT</th>
<th>LACKS MERIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board requests written response from instructor (within a week) and schedules a hearing (within two weeks). If a resolution to the problem presents itself, the hearing may be terminated. If no resolution seems satisfactory to the Board and the principal parties, the hearing will lead to the Board making a recommendation to the Provost (within two weeks).</td>
<td>Within two working days of determination, Board chair notifies student no further action taken unless Student rebuts with new evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within two working days of determination, Board chair notifies student no further action taken unless:

Student rebuts with new evidence

Within two weeks of Board chair's receipt of student's letter, Fairness Board reviews complaint and determines if case:

MERIT | NO MERIT

Comment [M81]: Deleted "the"
Comment [M82]: This step was changed to reflect the first step indicated in the procedures sect A. Nowhere in the procedures does it indicate the student is to meet with the counseling center and therefore, this step was deleted and replaced.
Comment [M83]: Second step changed to indicate exact order of actions taken by student so it now matches the written document Procedures, section a, first paragraph.
Comment [M84]: Step remains same; reworded to reflect language used in procedures document.
Comment [M85]: Step remains the same, however, changed in wording to again reflect the language used in the Procedures document.
Comment [M86]: Text remains exactly the same, however, the first letter in the first word of each line was capitalized.
Comment [M87]: Fundamentally the same, however, reworded to reflect actual language used in the Procedures document.
Comment [M88]: No Changes
Comment [M89]: Inserted statement to clarify process as indicated in the Procedures document.
RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC DISHONESTY:
CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM PROCEDURES

1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the attached Academic Dishonesty:
Cheating and Plagiarism procedures.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: October 5 2010
ACADEMIC DISHONESTY: CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM

684 Academic Dishonesty: Cheating and Plagiarism
The University will not condone academic cheating or plagiarism in any form. The faculty is expected to uphold and support the highest academic standards in this matter. Instructors should be diligent in reducing potential opportunities for academic cheating and plagiarism to occur. Students' rights shall be ensured through attention to due process, as detailed below.

684.1 Definition of Cheating
Cheating is defined as obtaining or attempting to obtain, or aiding another to obtain credit for work, or any improvement in evaluation of performance, by any dishonest or deceptive means. Cheating includes, but is not limited to: lying; copying from another's test or examination; discussion at any time of questions or answers on an examination or test, unless such discussion is specifically authorized by the instructor; taking or receiving copies of an exam without the permission of the instructor; using or displaying notes, "cheat sheets," or other information devices inappropriate to the prescribed test conditions; allowing someone other than the officially enrolled student to represent same.

684.2 Policy on Procedure for Addressing Cheating
Cheating requires, at a minimum, an "F" assigned to the assignment, exam, or task; the course grade shall, at a minimum, reflect the assigned "F"; and further attendance in the course is prohibited at the instructor's discretion. The instructor may assign an "F" course grade for an incidence of cheating. However, if a student appeals the charge of cheating, s/he shall be permitted to remain in the class through the appeals process. The instructor is obligated to place evidence of the cheating in writing before the vice President of Student Affairs with the copies to the department head of the student's major. Physical evidence, circumstantial evidence, and testimony of observation may be included. Said memorandum should notify the student that if s/he denies cheating, an appeal is possible through the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR) once the department head of the course of record has been consulted regarding the appeal.

a) Instructors should be confident that cheating has occurred; if there is any doubt, the student should be consulted and/or additional information sought prior to taking action for cheating.

b) The student should be notified by memorandum of the instructor's determination that cheating has occurred and the intended punishment. Said memorandum should notify the student that if s/he denies cheating: (1) the department head of the course of record will be given an opportunity to resolve the situation to the satisfaction of both parties; and (2) if the situation remains unresolved, an appeal of the finding of cheating (though not of the punishment, if the finding of cheating is upheld) is available through the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR).

c) Cheating requires, at a minimum, an "F" assigned to the assignment, exam, or task, and this "F" must be reflected in the course grade. The instructor may assign an "F" course grade for an incidence of cheating.
d) Irrespective of whether an appeal is made, the instructor is obligated to submit to the OSRR director a Confidential Faculty Report of Academic Dishonesty. Physical evidence, circumstantial evidence, and testimony of observation may be attached.

e) If an appeal is made, the grade assigned for cheating and the associated course grade cannot be appealed to the Fairness Board should the OSRR confirm the incidence of cheating.

f) The Vice President of Student Affairs OSRR director shall determine if any disciplinary action is required in addition to the assignment of a failing grade. Disciplinary actions which are possible include, but are not limited to: required special counseling, special paper or research assignments, loss of student teaching or research appointments, removal from a course, loss of membership in organizations, suspension or dismissal from individual programs or from the University. The most severe of the possible actions shall be reserved for grievances cheating offenses or more than one offense by an individual.

684.3 Definition of Plagiarism

Plagiarism is defined as the act of using the ideas or work of another person or persons as if they were one's own without giving proper credit to the source. Such an act is not plagiarism if it is ascertained that the ideas were arrived at through independent reasoning or logic or where the thought or idea is common knowledge. Acknowledgement of an original author or source must be made through appropriate references; e.g., quotation marks, footnotes, or commentary. Examples of plagiarism include but are not limited to the following: the submission of a work, either in part or in whole completed by another; failure to give credit for ideas, statements, facts or conclusions which rightfully belong to another; failure to use quotation marks (or other means of setting apart, such as the use of indentation or a different font size) when quoting directly from another, whether it be a paragraph, a sentence, or even a part thereof; close and lengthy paraphrasing of another's writing without credit or originality; use of another's project or programs or part thereof without giving credit.

684.4 Policy on Procedure for Addressing Plagiarism

a) Instructors should be confident that plagiarism has occurred; if there is any doubt, the student should be consulted and/or additional information sought prior to taking action for plagiarism. Student's rights shall be ensured through attention to due process.

b) Plagiarism may be considered a form of cheating and therefore subject to the same policy procedure which requires notification to the Vice President of Student Affairs and includes possible disciplinary action (see Section 684.2). OSRR director and, at a minimum, an "F" assigned to the assignment, exam, or task (See Section 684.2). However, as there may be a technical plagiarism which is may be the result of poor learning or poor attention to format, and may occur without any intent to deceive; consequently, some instructor discretion is appropriate. Under such circumstances, notification to the Vice President of Student Affairs is not required. Provided that there was no obvious intent to deceive, an instructor may choose to counsel the student and offer a remedy (within her/his authority) which is less severe than that required for cheating. (If in doubt about her/his authority to offer a particular remedy, the instructor should consult OSRR.) Even under these circumstances, the instructor must submit to the OSRR director a Confidential Faculty Report of Academic Dishonesty.
c) An instructor may not penalize a student for plagiarism in any way without advising the student by memorandum that a penalty is being imposed. The instructor should further advise that an appeal is possible through the OSRR once the department head has been consulted regarding the appeal. The student in said memorandum that if s/he denies committing plagiarism: (1) the department head of the course of record will be given an opportunity to resolve the situation to the satisfaction of both parties; and (2) if the situation remains unresolved, an appeal of the finding of plagiarism (though not of the punishment, if the finding of plagiarism is upheld) is possible through OSRR.
CONFIDENTIAL FACULTY REPORT OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

1. Name and ID number of Student

2. Course in which the incident occurred ___________________ Date of the incident ___________________

3. Witnesses and role (e.g. student, faculty, staff) if applicable:
   Name: ____________________
   Name: ____________________

4. Nature of the alleged offence intended to gain unfair academic advantage

5. Briefly describe the incident and, if any, subsequent investigation. How did you discover the incident? What events did you observe? What statements were made by the persons present? You may attach an additional report.

6. What actions did you take to sanction the student?
   □ None
   □ Counseled student
   □ Reduction in assignment grade
   □ Reduction in course grade
   □ Other (please describe)

7. In your assessment, did the student understand that he or she was committing an act of academic dishonesty?

8. Do you include a statement regarding academic dishonesty in your course documents? If so, please provide it.
   □ Yes, in the syllabus or on Blackboard
   □ Yes, on individual exams or assignments
   □ No
   Comments, if any: ____________________

9. Resolution Options
   Based on this incident alone, do you recommend that the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities issue a warning letter or file formal charges?

Name of reporting faculty member: ____________________ Date ____________________
Department: ____________________ Contact Information: ____________________

Submission Options: Print Form Submit by Email

Click "Print Form" button above, return completed form with attached copies of all supporting documentation to: Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities, Building 124, Room 127; or click "Submit by Email" button above and attach copies of all supporting documentation to the email.

THIS INFORMATION IS COMMUNICATED ON A NEED-TO-KNOW BASIS AND IS PROTECTED BY THE FAMILY EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT
Cal Poly: Division of Student Affairs
WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Research and Professional Development Committee during 2009 did a review of the Retention Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Focus Group Report; and

WHEREAS, On May 1 2009 the Academic Senate Research and Professional Development Committee endorsed recommendations 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the RPT Focus Group Report; and

WHEREAS, On June 2 2009 the Academic Senate endorsed recommendations 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the RPT Focus Group Report; and

WHEREAS, On March 16 2010 the Academic Senate Instruction Committee submitted its comments to recommendations 4, 5, 10, and 11 of the RPT Focus Group Report; and

WHEREAS, On April 6 2010, recommendations 4, 5, 10, and 11 of the RPT Focus Group Report were forwarded to the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee for its review; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee concluded its review and submitted its comments to recommendations 4, 5, 10, and 11 of the RPT Focus Group Report; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the Faculty Affairs Committee comments on items 4, 5, 10, and 11 of the RPT Focus Group Report as attached; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Affairs Committee comments be forwarded to the Provost and the members of the Retention Promotion and Tenure Focus Group for attachment in the RPT Focus Group Report.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: October 25 2010
Revised: November 2 2010
Focus Group’s Recommendation #4. “The implementation of an online student evaluation pilot program in the College of Liberal Arts and the Orfalea College of Business to study and evaluate the effectiveness, benefits, and disadvantages of online student evaluation.”

FAC observations:

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

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

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

FAC observations:

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

1. Faculty must volunteer to participate in the pilot study.
2. The Administration must provide appropriate support to the faculty to ensure that faculty workload does not increase due to participation in the pilot study.
3. The Provost designated committee should contain significant faculty involvement.
4. As in the current system, WPAF files must be returned to the faculty member. The system must ensure that no copies are maintained elsewhere.

5. The pilot study must allow for, and support, a reviewer who wants to use paper copy instead of the electronic format.

6. The evaluation of the effectiveness of the pilot study must be accomplished with significant faculty involvement.

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

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

FAC Recommendations on Focus Group recommendation #10:

The departments should articulate policies indicating how or if faculty participation in assessment can be linked to teaching, service, professional development or some combination of them all.

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

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

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

FAC opposes the standardization of "student evaluations, grade distributions, and other relative evaluative parameters," as recommended by the Focus Group. FAC recommendation:

Departments and colleges should continue their work to update and further clarify their RPT criteria and processes and provide direction for faculty members to evaluate teaching effectiveness in the peer review framework.
Retention Promotion and Tenure Focus Group Report

February 5, 2009

Chair: Al Liddicoat, Assistant Vice President for Academic Personnel
Phil Bailey, Dean College of Science and Mathematics
Bruno Giberti, Professor of Architecture
Linda Halisky, Dean College of Liberal Arts
Mike Miller, Dean of the Library Services
Mike Suess, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel
Brian Tietje, Associate Dean Orfalea College of Business

Overview

The Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Focus Group instituted by Provost Durgin was given the task to review the RPT procedures and policies throughout the University, to identify best practices and issues, and to make recommendations for areas of improvement. Faculty members and administrators with a broad range of experiences and diverse backgrounds were selected to participate in this focus group. The group began by reviewing campus policies, committee reports, and faculty survey results including the Collaborative On Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey conducted during the 2006-2007 academic year, the "Academic Senate Subcommittee on Research and Professional Development report to the Academic Senate" dated May 8, 2007, and the “Recommendations on Providing Workload Relief for the College of Engineering Faculty Engaged in Scholarly Activities”, January 4, 2007. The committee then identified a set of issues that affect probationary faculty members engaged in the RPT process and their ability to be successful as teacher-scholars at Cal Poly. Next, the committee reviewed RPT policies, criteria, and practices, identified best practices, and considered an electronic RPT evaluation process. Finally, the focus group compiled a set of recommendations included in this report to improve faculty success and the RPT policies, procedures, and processes at Cal Poly.

Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education

In winter 2007, Cal Poly participated in the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) project endorsed by the Harvard Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the project was to determine factors that are important to the success and job satisfaction of probationary faculty, as well as to enhance the programs that best serve the needs of new faculty members at Cal Poly. The COACHE survey was designed to solicit the perspectives of full-time, tenure-track faculty members and to study aspects of tenure and promotion, the nature of work, policies and practices, as well as culture, climate, and collegiality. Fifty-six universities across the country participate in the survey, including seven California State University Campuses- San Luis Obispo, Pomona, Fullerton, Long Beach, San Bernardino, San Marcos, and Sonoma State University.

The COACHE survey results indicate that the probationary faculty members at Cal Poly feel that the criteria for tenure in the area of professional development and service are less clear and reasonable as compared to the faculty members at the other institutions that participated in the survey. Specifically, faculty members from Cal Poly expressed lower satisfaction in the following areas:
1. Cal Poly faculty members rate the tenure standards (acceptable threshold) in their departments to be less clear than faculty members in the CSU and at other institutions (what is expected is clear and reasonable as a scholar, as a campus citizen, and as an advisor to students.)

2. Cal Poly faculty members report less satisfaction with resources and support for scholarly activities than faculty members in the CSU and at other institutions (time, number of courses, facilities, computing services, and research services.)

3. Cal Poly and CSU faculty members expressed concern over the effectiveness of a policy on the upper limit on teaching and service obligations and the balance between family and personal time.

4. Cal Poly faculty reports less satisfaction with opportunities for collaboration and professional interaction with senior faculty than faculty in the CSU and at other institutions.

The 2008 report of the Academic Senate Research and Professional Development Committee indicates that the understanding of the Teacher-Scholar Model needs strengthening on this campus and that at times there is a lack of consistency among various levels of review in applying the standards for tenure and promotion. Furthermore, this report indicates that the University should provide clearer guidance on the expectations for Professional Development Plans (PDP) and a process to approve and hold faculty members accountable to their plans. Peer advising and/or mentorship may provide an avenue for feedback as faculty members develop as teacher-scholars.

The Focus group reflected on the time demands of the probationary faculty. In order for faculty members to be successful as teacher-scholars, the group felt that probationary faculty should have sufficient time and resources to engage in scholarly activities, particularly during their first two years at Cal Poly. This sentiment was reinforced in the Research and Professional Development Committee's report. Furthermore, the committee affirmed that reduced service obligations, a more efficient RPT process, and better guidance on preparing working personnel action files and professional development plans will increase faculty members’ time for professional development.

**Best Practices**

The focus group identified several best practices that could be used to guide college and university recommendations. These practices include personnel policies and criteria processes, a practical definition of the Teacher-Scholar Model, faculty professional development support, digital archival of faculty work and accomplishments, faculty development, online student evaluations, and faculty mentoring. This section presents a brief overview of these best practices.

**Personnel Policies, Procedures, and Evaluation Criteria.** The College of Science and Mathematics "Personnel Policies Procedures and Evaluation Criteria" is an example of an efficient and consistent RPT process that has been established for all departments in the college. The focus group identified the following positive aspects of this document:

- Reduced the number of performance evaluations during the tenure process (Part III-B).
- Guidance on developing Working Personnel Action Files (WPAFs) for periodic reviews (Part IV-A) and for performance reviews (Part V-B).
- Example outline for preparing WPAFs (Appendix A).
- Criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (Part V-D).
- Periodic review of newly promoted tenured associate professors in 3rd Year (Part VII-A).
• Procedures for student evaluations (Part X).
• Candidates for promotion are expected to submit a professional development plan with a plan to sustain their role as teacher-scholars.

The “Library Faculty Handbook of Personnel Policies and Procedures” Section III-4 provides an example of the evaluation criteria for other factors of consideration. This document provides an excellent discussion of collegiality, professionalism, and successful interaction with coworkers. The document states that, “Collegiality represents a reciprocal relationship among colleagues and a value system that views diverse members of a university community as critical for the progress and success of its academic mission.... Moreover, collegiality among associates involves appreciation of and respect for differences in expertise, ideas, background, and viewpoints.”

Teacher-Scholar Model. The Orfalea College of Business’ “Faculty Annual Report” (FAR) provides an approach to college-wide resource allocation based on a quantitative review of the accomplishments and the professional development plans of the faculty. The FAR document has also defined the Teacher-Scholar Model in a flexible way that allows faculty members to vary their emphasis on teaching, research and service throughout their careers. In the FAR evaluation process a weighting based on the faculty members’ work emphasis is used in conjunction with an established numeric criteria to compute a composite score. The locus of service obligations changes from department to University as faculty members progress through the ranks. For example, tenured faculty members are often expected to serve on Peer Review Committees and in leadership positions within the department, college, and the University. The Orfalea College of Business uses an electronic tool, Digital Measures, to track faculty achievement and activities for resource allocation and accreditation purposes.

Faculty Professional Development Support. Recently, the College of Liberal Arts has established a system to support faculty members in their professional development and scholarly activities. Faculty members submit proposals to the College of Liberal Arts requesting one or more course release(s), student assistant support, or funds for travel that will enable them to bring their scholarly work to completion and present it to the community of scholars. The College provides some funds and support for course releases, and in some cases the College partners with departments to provide student assistant time and additional financial support for faculty professional development. At times, CLA has been able to support special unexpected faculty professional development opportunities in addition to their regularly supported activities. Examples of this supplemental support include a course release to finish a textbook, travel support to allow faculty members to present their work at prestigious invited engagements such as concerts or performances, and support for student assistance in the collection and analysis of research data. In several cases, resources are used to supplement partial support provided through the State Faculty Support Grant Program or other similar funding sources. The College of Liberal Arts reports that their support has been highly effective and not only has it enabled faculty members to be successful in their scholarly activities, but also the support has enhanced faculty morale and their sense of scholarly community within the college.

Digital Repository of Faculty Work and Accomplishments. Many universities use electronic tools to capture faculty accomplishments which can be used for dissemination of knowledge, accreditation, alumni communications, advancement, and RPT purposes. Cal Poly is in the process of implementing the Digital Commons to provide a repository for faculty work and accomplishments. Faculty members voluntarily enter their work into the Digital Commons to allow students, faculty members, staff, administrators, and the community to access their scholarly work through an electronic portfolio. The Digital Commons provides an example of an institutional repository capable of capturing information and making it available in an electronic
portfolio. There may be opportunities to apply information technology such as the Digital Commons to the RPT process and in some cases for program accreditation. Academic software tools such as Digital Measures may interface directly with the library's Digital Commons and if adopted this would create a seamless workflow from the college to the library, thus avoiding duplicate effort.

**Faculty Development.** The COACHE survey included custom questions used to solicit feedback on faculty support that is provided through the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). 84%, 60%, and 29% of faculty reported that participating in CTL activities have strongly enhanced or somewhat enhanced their teaching, professional development, and service respectively. More strikingly 92%, 86%, and 58% of female faculty report that participating in CTL activities have strongly enhanced or somewhat enhanced their teaching, professional development, and service respectively. These results indicate that the majority of probationary faculty members find that their involvement in CTL has benefited their teaching and professional development. Furthermore, an overwhelming majority of female faculty report that their involvement with CTL has enhanced their teaching, professional development, and service to the University.

**Online Student Evaluations.** Information provided through student evaluations is of particular interest to the University since the data provides both formative feedback that can be used to improve teaching effectiveness and summative feedback used for personnel actions. Some departments in the College of Liberal Arts have been using online student evaluations for their online courses and are interested in exploring the use of online student evaluations in face-to-face courses. The CSU, CFA, and Academic Senate CSU formed a joint committee to investigate student evaluations in response to Article 15.19 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement dated May 15, 2007. This committee was charged to study the “best and most effective practices for the student evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness.” The study evaluated instruments used for student evaluation and the use of online student evaluations. The committee documented their findings in the “Report on Student Evaluations of Teaching,” dated March 12, 2008. This report provides suggestions for implementing online student evaluations and interpreting the results of these evaluations. Furthermore, the report encourages campuses to carry out research to assess the validity and reliability of online student evaluations.

San Diego State University conducted a two-year formal study of online student evaluations during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 academic years. Their study investigated the response rate and mean ratings for traditional and online student evaluations conducted for courses in the College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts. Paper and pencil and online student evaluation results from forty-four courses that used five instruments with 5,972 respondents were analyzed. The results of this study are documented in the “EDTEC 798: Independent Study – Effort Report.” The results of this study show that online student evaluations generated higher response rates for four of the five instruments analyzed. The researcher notes that the form that did not demonstrate a higher online response rate had the smallest sample size: two courses with 176 responses. The aggregate response rate for online evaluations was 82% as compared to 73% for paper and pencil evaluations. No significant difference was found in the mean ratings for online versus paper and pencil evaluations: 4.238 and 4.294 respectively.

San Jose State University’s “Interpretation Guide for Student Opinions of Teaching Effectiveness” documents a method to normalize the student evaluation results by departments and colleges so that valid comparisons can be made. The affects of grade level, course size, and major versus non-major courses were also analyzed. This report provides insight and methods that can be used to gather and interpret student evaluation data. These methods could be used to compare traditional and online student evaluations and to help the University transition to online student evaluations.
**Faculty Mentoring.** The College of Agriculture, Food, and Environmental Sciences has developed a formal faculty mentoring program for their faculty. This is a volunteer mentoring program that has evolved over a period of seven years. The college mentoring program coordinator meets with interested faculty members in the fall quarter to explain the mentoring program and the roles and responsibilities of the faculty involved. Faculty members wishing to be mentored fill out a survey to identify specific area of mentoring interest. These areas of interest include teaching, professional development, establishing a research program, faculty advising, Cal Poly culture, or other faculty defined topics. Similarly, faculty mentors fill out a form that includes their strengths and identifies the areas that they feel qualified and comfortable mentoring faculty members. The mentoring program coordinator then pairs mentees with mentors and asks them to work together to define their expectations, goals, and plan to accomplish these goals. The program coordinator tracks the mentoring relationships and coordinates a recognition event in the spring quarter for the faculty participants.

Several faculty members have reported benefits from the program and several faculty members who have been mentored later become mentors themselves. The program coordinator commented on non-traditional pairings such as an instance when a senior faculty member requested mentoring for the use of technology in his classroom and was paired with a junior faculty member who was a technology expert. The mentoring program coordinator plans to formally evaluate the impact of the program using survey instruments in the near future.

**Committee Recommendations**

This section presents a list of recommendations identified by the committee and an implementation table that includes champions and a rough timeline to guide the implementation. The first five recommendations focus on enhancing University and college procedures, and the remaining six recommendations include suggestions to clarify, support, and evaluate faculty professional development, teaching, and service accomplishments.

1. **The University should provide clear guidelines and a common format for the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF).** A common format will facilitate the preparation and review of Working Personnel Action Files. The committee recommends that the University standardize a template of required materials which should be submitted in a small binder and allow faculty members to submit additional supporting materials in a separate binder as needed. The small binder would include a summary of teaching and work assignments, student evaluations, a list of scholarly activities and research projects, and service activities.

2. **Each college should establish common faculty evaluation procedures to be used for all departments within the college.** Many departments within a college have similar but different RPT procedures. This adds to confusion of probationary faculty members within a college and unnecessarily complicates the work of the college peer review committee which is required to review and understand the documents for all of the departments they review. Departments should use the college procedures and amplify the college criteria used to evaluate teaching, professional development, and service within the discipline.

3. **The University should recommend that colleges consider the multiyear appointment procedure for probationary faculty that has been developed by the College of Science and Mathematics.** The multiyear appointment procedure developed by CSM allows three 2-year appointments for probationary faculty. In the first year of each two year appointment a periodic review is conducted to provide faculty formative feedback as they make progress.
towards promotion and tenure. During probationary years two and four, summative performance reviews are conducted for retention to a subsequent two-year appointment. In year six, faculty members undergo a performance review for promotion and tenure. This procedure reduces the time faculty members spend preparing voluminous WPAF files for performance reviews, as well as the time faculty members and administrators spend reviewing materials, while providing formative feedback each year to help develop and prepare the faculty to be successful as teacher-scholars.

4. The implementation of an online student evaluation pilot program in the College of Liberal Arts and the Orfalea College of Business to study and evaluate the effectiveness, benefits, and disadvantages of online student evaluation. Online student evaluations have been successfully implemented University-wide at San Diego State University with no significant decrease in response rate or change in mean ratings. Online student evaluations provide a convenient mechanism for students to provide feedback of teaching effectiveness, do not take time from course instruction, and give all students an opportunity to submit feedback. The data collected via online student evaluations can be stored directly into an electronic database or faculty e-portfolio. On-line student evaluations significantly reduce the time required to prepare and process evaluation packages by the department staff, faculty, and ITS. Online student evaluations allow easily customizable instruments that may include common questions defined by the University, college, department and/or instructor. Electronic reports can automatically normalize or scale the results by factors such as course level, modes of instruction, enrollment, or major versus non-major course. Thus electronic data analysis and interpretation of student evaluations may better inform instructors and reviewers of faculty teaching effectiveness. The Provost should designate a committee to develop an RFP, evaluate potential vendors, and report recommendations to the Deans’ Council. Members of the vendor selection committee should include a college dean or associate dean, and representatives from the Academic Senate, Academic Personnel, ITS, and the Library.

5. The University should explore the use of electronic faculty evaluation processes and set up a pilot process in one college. Several software tools are available that facilitate electronic review of faculty members via e-portfolios; the committee briefly reviewed the Activity Insight software package from DigitalMeasures. There appear to be several advantages to using an e-portfolio for faculty evaluations. These advantages include extracting and archiving information directly from University databases such as teaching assignments, grading patterns, student evaluation results, and scholarly work included in the Digital Commons; consistent organization, categorization, and presentation of materials; the ability to run reports and summarize data electronically; and electronic control over the evaluation process (online access to personnel files, deadline notification, verification of process requirements, automatic WPAF access logs, and security to protect personnel information). The Provost should designate a committee to develop an RFP, evaluate potential vendors, and report recommendations to the Deans’ Council. Members of the vendor selection committee should include a college dean or associate dean, and representatives from the Academic Senate, Academic Personnel, ITS, and the Library.

6. The University should produce a comprehensive statement on scholarship and professional development to reflect the University’s vision of the Teacher-Scholar Model. This statement should define the Teacher-Scholar Model within the context of Cal Poly and it should be in concert with the Teacher-Scholar section of the WASC self-study and the various other University documents on this subject. The statement will provide guidance to faculty members as they develop as teacher-scholars at Cal Poly and should include the benefits of the Teacher-Scholar Model to the students, faculty and the University.
7. The University should establish guidelines to assist faculty in the development of Professional Development Plans to encompass teaching, scholarship/professional development, and service, and to clarify the method by which they will report the progress they have made toward their goals. Probationary faculty members are expected to write and maintain Professional Development Plans (PDP) that communicate their scholarly goals and state what they intend to accomplish by the time they are considered for tenure and promotion. The PDP should include a timeline for activities that support their tenure and promotion requests, short- and long-term goals, scholarly activities of substantial quality, and intended external validation of their work. In addition, the University should define a common process for faculty to submit Professional Development Plans, gain the endorsement of their peers and approval by their dean/provost, update and archive the plans as they progress, and define how faculty members report their accomplishments against their plans in the RPT process. Candidates for promotion should be expected to submit a five-year plan indicating how they will sustain their development as teacher-scholars.

8. The University should establish an environment and develop the resources to support faculty members in their endeavor to become successful teacher-scholars. Policies should include reduced teaching and service assignments for new faculty members to allow them to focus on developing their teaching and scholarly activities as they begin their careers at Cal Poly. Deans should dedicate funds to provide assigned time for scholarly activities. Departments should be encouraged to schedule courses such that faculty members have blocks of time to focus on scholarly activities.

9. Specific criteria and expectations regarding service should be included in college RPT guidelines. The COACHE survey indicates that the University should better define the service expectations for tenure. A lack of clarity of criteria leads to misaligned priorities and unnecessary anxiety for the faculty. The college RPT documents should include a discussion about the expectation of service contributions and the roles and responsibilities of faculty members as they progress from assistant to full professor.

10. The University or colleges should articulate a policy indicating how learning assessment can be linked to teaching, service, professional development, or some combination of them all. Faculty members have a significant role in learning assessment for the courses they teach, program curricula, program accreditation, and the scholarship of teaching. Currently college and department RPT documents are silent and ambiguous on faculty expectations in the area of learning assessment. Clarity of faculty expectations with respect to learning assessment will lead to a better understanding and implementation of learning assessment.

11. The University or colleges should provide direction for faculty members to better evaluate teaching effectiveness. Peer Review Committee evaluators need guidance in how to best determine if instructors are effective teachers. Examples might include evaluating the instructor's process of defining learning outcomes for their courses, developing appropriate measures to assess learning, and developing course content and activities that achieve student learning. All faculty members should include the course learning outcomes in their syllabi so that teaching effectiveness can be evaluated against course learning outcomes. Quantitative data related to teaching effectiveness such as student evaluations, grade distributions, and other relevant evaluative parameters should be standardized. Student evaluation surveys could be rewritten to place greater importance on learning and the instructor's role in facilitating student learning in order to better assist faculty members in evaluating effective teaching and learning. In accordance with the MOU requirement to consult with the faculty of a department or equivalent unit, college deans should address the expectation of
probationary faculty to evaluate all courses and amend college guidelines accordingly. Colleges should expect probationary faculty to include a constructive narrative statement reflecting and interpreting the results of their student evaluations.

Recommendation Implementation Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Champion</th>
<th>Develop</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Pilot online student evaluations</td>
<td>Provost Committee</td>
<td>Winter and Spring 2009</td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pilot Electronic RPT evaluations</td>
<td>Provost Committee</td>
<td>Winter and Spring 2009</td>
<td>AY 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Support for scholarship</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Winter and Spring 2009</td>
<td>AY 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WHEREAS, Faculty members who serve on the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, who are always experienced in undergraduate education, do not always have experience teaching in graduate programs or in thesis supervision; and

WHEREAS, Some recent newly proposed graduate programs have been nontraditional programs, offered to working professionals, in special session, or online; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly anticipates more graduate programs, traditional and nontraditional, over the next several years; and

WHEREAS, Newly proposed graduate programs and courses warrant careful review by faculty members with experience in graduate teaching and thesis supervision; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate establish a standing subcommittee of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee to review graduate course and program proposals; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Constitution of the Faculty and Bylaws of the Academic Senate be amended as follows:

To be added under VIII.H.2

2. Curriculum (and its subcommittees: U.S. Cultural Pluralism and Graduate Programs subcommittees)

To be added under 1.2.b.

Graduate Programs Subcommittee

There will be a standing subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee responsible for the review of proposals for new/revised graduate courses and programs. As with the Cultural Pluralism subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee (AS-396-92-CC), Graduate Programs subcommittee members shall not be comprised of a
subset of the Curriculum Committee, but instead, members shall include one faculty member from each college with experience in graduate level teaching and supervision, the chair of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (or a designee of the chair), and as an ex officio member, the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs. Recommendations from this subcommittee will be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee who will, in turn, submit them to the Academic Senate for approval.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: October 27 2010
RESOLUTION ON THE FORMATION OF A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Background Statement:

This resolution is a companion to that above and addresses the composition and responsibilities of the committee which will evaluate the content of courses submitted for fulfillment of the cultural pluralism baccalaureate requirement. We propose a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee because all new courses and substantial changes to old ones should be considered by the CC; yet this is a specific area of review which merits its own deliberations.

WHEREAS, The establishment of a subcommittee of a standing academic senate committee involves a change in the Constitution and By-Laws of the Academic Senate; be it

RESOLVED, That said Constitution and By-Laws be amended as follows:

To be added under 1.3.b.

(1) Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee:
There will be a standing subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee for the initial review of courses proposed to fulfill the Cultural Pluralism Baccalaureate requirement. This subcommittee shall consist of seven voting members, one from each college and one from the professional staff.
Terms shall be for two years, staggered to ensure continuity.

Senate caucuses will solicit and receive application for membership. The slate of Vicllicants 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 Director of Ethnic Studies and a representative from the General Education and Breadth Committee and the Curriculum Committee.

Selection of courses to fulfill the requirement shall follow the criteria listed in AS-395-920

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

submitted by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
Christina A. Bailey, Chair