



Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, January 30, 2018
01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm

- I. **Minutes:** Approval of January 9, 2018 minutes (pp. 2-3).

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

- III. **Reports:**
 - A. Academic Senate Chair:
 - B. President's Office:
 - C. Provost:
 - D. Statewide Senate:
 - E. CFA:
 - F. ASI:

- IV. **Business Item(s):**
 - A. **Appointment to Academic Senate Committee** (p. 4).
 - B. **Appointments to Exceptional Student Service Committee** (pp. 5-6).
 - C. **Resolution on Academic Program Review:** Ken Brown, Chair of the Program Review Task Force (pp. 7-11).
 - D. **Resolution on Modifications to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate Election of Part-Time Academic Employee Representative:** Dustin Stegner, Chair of the Academic Senate (pp. 12-13).

- V. **Discussion Item(s):**

- VI. **Adjournment:**



Minutes of the Academic Senate Executive Committee

Tuesday, January 9, 2018

01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm

- I. Minutes: none.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, announced that senator elections to the Academic Senate would be occurring during Winter Quarter.
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair: none.
 - B. President's Office: Jessica Darin, President's Chief of Staff, announced that the comment period for the Master Plan has ended and that the final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be released later in the year.
 - C. Provost: none.
 - D. Statewide Senate: none.
 - E. CFA: none.
 - F. ASI: none.
- IV. Business Item(s):
 - A. **Appointment of Xiaowei Cai as substitute for Eivis Qenani on Faculty Affairs Committee for Winter and Spring Quarter 2018.** M/S/P to approve Xiaowei Cai as substitute for Eivis Qenani on Faculty Affairs Committee for Winter and Spring Quarter 2018.
 - B. **Appointments to Academic Senate Committees.** M/S/P to approve Adrienne Greve, City and Regional Planning, to the Grants Review Committee and Jesse Vestermark, Library, to the GE Governance Board (Winter, Spring, Fall 2018).
 - C. **Approval of USCP Review Committee Procedures.** The USCP Review Committee Procedures were evaluated. M/S/P to approve the USCP Review Committee Procedures. The Procedures can be found at: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/acadsen_comm_documents/USCP_Review_Comm_Procedures.pdf.
 - D. **New Charge for Curriculum Committee to Review the Existing Draft of Policy on Blended Programs with a Resolution Due Fall 2018.** The Curriculum Committee would be tasked with reviewing and editing the Policy on Blended Programs draft and presenting a resolution to the Academic Senate in Fall 2018. M/S/P to approve the charge for Curriculum Committee to Review the Existing Draft of Policy on Blended Programs with a Resolution Due Fall 2018.

V. Discussion Item(s):

- A. **Approval of 2019-2020 Academic Calendar.** The 2019-2020 Academic Calendar was approved by President Armstrong with a Thursday starting day for Fall Quarter 2019. A copy of the calendar can be found at: <https://registrar.calpoly.edu/2019-20-academic-calendar>.
- B. **Timeline for Election of Part-time Academic Employee.** The timeline for the election of the Part-time Academic Employee representative was discussed.

VI. Adjournment: 4:10 PM

Submitted by,



Mark Borges

Academic Senate Student Assistant

01.24.18 (gg)

Vacancies for 2017-2019 Academic Senate Committees

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee (winter & spring 2018)

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

Instruction Committee

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee (2017-2018)

Grants Review Committee

Lanny Griffin, Biomedical Engineering (20 years at Cal Poly) Tenured

I believe that my experience with grants would serve the interest of the College of Engineering as well as those of Cal Poly.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATH

Fairness Board

ORFALEA COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

Fairness Board

GE Governance Board (2017-2020)

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES

Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee

Sustainability Committee

SENIOR PROJECT TASK FORCE - Vacancies for CLA and CSM

Vacancies for 2017-2018 University Committees

ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COUNCIL - PCS (2017-2019)

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVIEW COMMITTEE – CAFES (2017-2020)

01.24.18

Exceptional Student Service Committee Nominations

Each academic college shall have only one representative

College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences

Neal MacDougall, Agribusiness (20 years at Cal Poly) Tenured

I am interested in participating in the committee as it closely relates to my role as the Cal Poly representative to the California Faculty Association's (CFA) Council for Affirmative Action (CAA). In my work on the CAA at the state level, I have become familiar with how the program for the assigned time for exceptional service to students has operated at different campuses. I am hoping to make a contribution to this committee by sharing the experience of other campuses. Also, I have had extensive experience in other committees for the Academic Senate ranging from past work on (and as chair) of the Sustainability Committee as well as my current work on the General Education and Breadth Committee. I consider this committee work to be part of my contribution to the overall work of the Academic Senate and to the university in general.

College of Engineering

Kimberly Mastako, Civil & Environmental Engineering (20+ years at Cal Poly) Lecturer

My own job satisfaction has skyrocketed since I shifted from 'me-centered' teaching to 'student-centered' teaching. I've seen the positive outcomes of continually investing in enhanced accessibility and I know the commitment it takes: new skill sets to align courseware with universal design, and genuine flexibility to meet students where they are.. when they're ready. It would therefore be my pleasure to serve on the Exceptional Student Service Committee. I welcome the opportunity to support faculty who extend themselves beyond the traditional classroom to serve students of all abilities.

Students who are active with award-winning clubs typically receive excellent mentorship from their faculty advisors and industry partners. These students are highly visible; proactive in their own success. The typical student is much less visible; underrepresented students may be 'getting by' ..or just barely. Students who mostly encounter educational practices that are more suitable for accelerated learners begin to doubt their own potential. For many (including DRC students, EASL students, first-generation undergrads, students in crisis, etc.), learning outcomes become more achievable when they are also afforded direct support and encouragement.

My goal for the Exceptional Student Service Committee would be to support time, talent and energy by faculty on behalf of students who would otherwise remain underserved in achieving learning outcomes. In addition to prior committee experience,¹ I offer experience with high-impact educational practices and innovative outreach to students:

- Short videos before each lecture for student who don't read textbooks
- Fishbowl collaboration hours before each deliverable
- Chalk-and-talk lectures where all students are hands-on with their calculators
- SparkNotes style resource sheets for students who don't take lecture notes
- Video solutions to homework problems that can be watched again and again as needed
- After hours support on problem sets via instant messaging and ad hoc chat sessions
- Coffee shop sessions for casual chitchat; mentorship; coaching
- Alternative text tagged to exhibits; machine-readable; universally helpful in comprehending
- Affordable e-textbooks and library reserves
- Applied experience with just about instructional practice supported by CTLT

¹ Academic Council for International Programs, Hiring Committee: Instructional Designer (CTLT), Master Plan Update Advisory Committee: Circulation

College of Liberal Arts

Kelly Bennion, Psychology & Child Development (2 years at Cal Poly) Tenure track

I am interested in serving on the Exceptional Student Service Committee because I believe that the positive impact we can have on our students goes far beyond our time spent in the classroom. In thinking back to my own undergraduate experience as a first-generation student, had it not been for truly exceptional faculty

advisors and mentors, I would have been lost in preparing myself to enter a Ph.D. program (and more generally, in discerning what my steps should be following graduation). One of the reasons I chose to be at Cal Poly is because of the university's commitment to undergraduate education, so the idea of being able to take part in rewarding faculty members who are mentoring, advising, and serving students significantly beyond normal

expectations would be very fulfilling to me.

Another reason I would like to serve on the Exceptional Student Service Committee is because I am extremely passionate about the committee's mission. The aspect of service that arguably most underlies why I decided to become a professor is mentorship, particularly in helping students who are underrepresented in higher education navigate academia. For this reason, I founded and run a Mentoring Program for first-generation students within the Department of Psychology and Child Development, serve on our department diversity committee, spoke at the first annual Student of Color Summit about how to navigate STEM fields as an underrepresented student, and more. I would also be very interested to read applications about how are faculty are redesigning curricula to improve student access and success, as this is a topic I have thought about deeply as I design a new course in our major called "Orientation to the Psychology Major." From the committee's description, its mission is

something that I think about on a daily basis. Therefore, I believe I would strongly contribute to the discussion of discerning how to allocate WTUs to best support our students by giving faculty the time they need to make such profound impact.

Importantly, although I think about topics related to this committee's mission frequently, I believe I am very open-minded and able to judge a proposal based on its quality rather than personal biases (e.g., when serving on similar committees reviewing grants or when reviewing manuscripts). As such, I would look forward to giving thoughtful consideration to all proposals I come across. Finally, I would deeply enjoy learning more about the myriad ways in which my colleagues across campus support our students. I believe this would lead to me rethinking how I, too, can support my students to an even greater degree.

Patrick Howe, Journalism (6 Years at Cal Poly) Tenure track – received after deadline

I was fortunate to be awarded a reduced load last quarter under this program (for my advising of Mustang News). I don't plan to apply again in the foreseeable future, but the experience of applying and using the award did make me interested in the program and so I'm offering my help here, should you still need applicants.

College of Science and Mathematics

John Sharpe, Physics (20 years at Cal Poly) Tenured

A passionate interest of mine is student research and projects, and it seems to me that a relatively small subset of the faculty is carrying a lot of the weight on this. This especially includes faculty members who have little or no external support in the form of release time and grants but who innovatively use the infrastructure already at Cal Poly to provide cutting-edge and satisfying experiences for our students. I believe that this goes to the core of service to our students. I would thus like to see faculty members who are engaging in this type of activity recognized, encouraged, and supported. This is why I am volunteering to serve on the Exceptional Student Service Committee.

Joyce Lin, Mathematics (5 years at Cal Poly) Tenure track

I'm interested in serving on the Exceptional Student Service Committee in the Winter 2018. I have had a lot of experience with student mentoring, advising, and outreach and feel like my experience will be a valuable asset in helping to award assigned time. I have served on college and conference panels representing women in STEM fields, given community talks and presentations to attract underrepresented high school students to science and engineering fields, and served on various committees in our department focusing on mentoring and research with underrepresented students. By serving on this committee, I am hoping to both get more involved and also to give back to the Cal Poly community.

Adopted:

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

AS-__-18

RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

BACKGROUND: In 2016, the Academic Senate convened the Program Review Task Force, consisting of faculty, college administrators, and representation from the office of Academic Programs and Planning to review current practice related to academic program review and recommend to the Senate revisions to the relevant policies and procedures. The Program Review Task Force obtained feedback from faculty recently or currently involved in program review about best practices. Careful consideration of this feedback strongly suggests that annual revisiting of the outcomes of the program review in action plans would allow for an extension of the program review cycle for non-accredited programs from six to seven years. Accredited programs should continue to conduct program review at least every five years according to the cycle for renewal of accreditation.

WHEREAS, The Academic Programs and Planning website provides information on academic program review, including revised templates developed for the current cycle and based on informed judgment about best practices in program review and feedback from faculty involved in program review; and

WHEREAS, Policies and procedures for academic program review last formulated in 2000 (AS-552-00) and revised slightly in 2010 (AS-718-10) do not reflect current practices for academic program review; and

WHEREAS, Annual updates to program review action plans allow for the modest extension of the program review cycle for non-accredited programs from six to seven years; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate adopts the attached "Academic Program Review Policies and Procedures."

Proposed by: Program Review Task Force

Date: January 25, 2018

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Prepared by the Program Review Task Force
Winter 2018

Guiding Principles. Academic program review (APR) is a comprehensive and periodic review of academic programs, including General Education and interdisciplinary programs. APR is a function of the Provost, in conjunction with the College Deans, the Academic Senate, and the Dean of Graduate Education, and is coordinated by the office of Academic Programs and Planning (APP).

The goal of APR is to improve the quality and viability of each academic program by encouraging self study and strategic planning within programs. APR is not a review of academic departments as such, although it will inevitably address departmental issues. Each program, department, and college is responsible for making curricular decisions and programmatic offerings within existing resources. All such decisions shall be the purview of the faculty of the program, department, and/or college. Hence, APR should inform and be an essential component of academic planning and curriculum, budgeting, and accountability to internal and external audiences. APR provides information for planning decisions at every administrative level.

Academic program review of programs subject to professional or specialized accreditation or recognition will be coordinated to coincide with the accreditation/recognition review whenever possible. Documentation developed for accreditation/recognition reviews may already provide the essential requirements of APR, and, thus, may also be used for this purpose, but it is important to note that accreditation/recognition reviews can serve a different purpose than program reviews.

Definitions. The following definitions should help in distinguishing terms used throughout this document:

- Academic Program: a structured grouping of course work designed to meet an educational objective and usually leading to a baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree, or to a teaching credential. CSU policy defines General Education as an academic program.
- Department: an administrative unit that manages one or more academic programs.
- Program Administrator: the individual administratively responsible for the Program, whether a head, chair, or director.
- Program Representatives: the Program Administrator and other Program faculty members participating in the design and production of the self-study report.
- Program Review Team: the external reviewers appointed to conduct the site visit and compose the program review report.

Roles and Responsibilities. As required by the CSU Board of Trustees, academic programs should be reviewed every five to ten years. Wherever possible, APR will coincide with external accreditation/recognition. Programs with ten-year accreditation cycles will have an interim review. All non-accredited academic programs, including General Education, will be reviewed on a seven-year cycle. This schedule may be accelerated in individual cases either at the discretion of the Provost or College Dean, in consultation with the Program faculty, or in compliance with recommendations from prior program reviews. Programs in related disciplines or with similar missions may be reviewed on

concurrent cycles.

The Provost initiates APR through the Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, in collaboration with the College Dean and the Dean of Graduate Education.

Each APR is conducted by the Program Review Team (Team). Reviewers should be knowledgeable in the discipline/field of the program under review while bringing a perspective that comes from outside of the college or institution. The Program Administrator submits reviewer nominations to the College Dean who makes the final Team selection. The Team will normally be composed of (at least) three members to be selected using the following guidelines:

- One member internal to Cal Poly from a college different than that of the program under review
- Two external members representing the discipline of the program under review

The Team Chair will be identified, and one Team member will be the designated assessment reviewer to ensure that appropriate attention is given to this topic. The composition of the Team may change when the academic program review coincides with an accreditation/recognition review. In these instances, the role of the internal reviewer will be negotiated based on allowances of the accrediting/recognition body.

The APR process is intended to close the circle of inquiry, review, and improvement. Program Representatives and the Program Review Team assume distinct roles in the APR process:

- The self-study report is completed by the Program Representatives.
- The review of the self-study report and the site-visit is conducted by the Program Review Team, which documents its findings in the Team report.
- The strategic action plan is prepared by the Program Representatives, based on the findings of the self-study and the Team reports.

Elements of the Self-Study Report. In preparation for the review, the Program will undertake a thorough self study that addresses the program's mission, capacity (resources available to fulfill the mission), and effectiveness (the degree to which a program achieves its mission), all within the context of the College and University. To accomplish this objective, the inquiry-based self-study report consists of topics such as the following:

- Program Identity (e.g., history, context, mission, and progress since the last review)
- Program Elements (e.g., learning objectives, curriculum, and pedagogy)
- Program Resources (e.g., faculty, facilities, equipment, information resources, and budget)
- Program Effectiveness (e.g. student learning, persistence and graduation rates, student engagement, graduate success)
- Program Planning (e.g., admissions, instructional capacity, and employer demand)
- Program, University and/or System-Wide Themes (e.g., diversity and inclusion)

This outline is provided as an example. In the spirit of continuous improvement, specific elements of the self-study report template will be modified and improved as needed in response to institutional priorities and feedback provided by programs undergoing review. The current version of the self-

study report template will be accessible on the APP website.

Programs undergoing accreditation review may be asked to produce a supplemental document addressing the concerns of APR that are not addressed in the accreditation/recognition review.

APP will distribute the self-study report to the Team, College Dean, Provost, and the Dean of Graduate Education.

Site Visit and Team Report. Ideally, the Team will receive a copy of the self-study report around a month prior to the site visit. All Team members should read the self-study report and are encouraged to request additional materials as needed. A two-day site visit will be coordinated by the Department, in consultation with the College Dean and APP.

During the site visit, the Team will have access to the faculty, staff, students, and administrators, as well as any additional documentation or appointments deemed necessary for completion of the review. During the site visit, the Team should be provided with sufficient time to discuss their findings amongst themselves. The Team should also be given the opportunity to meet with the Program Representatives, including the Program Administrator, the College Dean, and the Provost to discuss possible outcomes of the review at the end of the site visit. It is the responsibility of the Team Chair to ensure that members of the Team work together throughout the review and that the final report reflects the input of all reviewers.

Within one month of the site visit, the Team will provide a draft report to APP for distribution to the Program Administrator, College Dean, and the Dean of Graduate Education (as applicable). In addition to commendations, the report should address the major issues facing the Program and the Program's discipline and suggest strategies for improvement. The Program Representatives will review the draft report solely for accuracy. After this review, a final Team report will be submitted to APP for distribution to the Program Administrator, College Dean, the Dean of Graduate Education, and the Provost.

Strategic Action Planning. The effectiveness of APR depends on the implementation of the appropriate recommendations contained in the Team report as well as insights gained during the self-study process. Based on these factors, the Program Representatives will draft a strategic action plan that responds to the findings of the self-study and the Team reports. An action plan meeting will be scheduled by APP, to include the Department, the College Dean, representatives from APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education (as applicable). The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the strategic action plan, obtaining input, feedback and support from the College Dean and others in attendance. Based on the feedback provided during the meeting, a finalized action plan is submitted to the College Dean, APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education. The Program Administrator and Program Representatives review the strategic action plan, update it if necessary, and provide APP with a copy on an annual basis, where it becomes a part of the program's institutional record.

A copy of the self-study report, Team report, and the strategic action plan will be kept on file with APP for two APR cycles. An annual APR summary will be prepared by APP for the Academic Senate.

Process Summary. The APR process can be summarized as follows:

1. The office of Academic Programs and Planning (APP) notifies the programs to be reviewed during spring quarter of the academic year before the academic year in which the department will produce the self-study.
2. For each program under review, a Program Review Team (Team) is appointed to read the self-study report and conduct a site visit. The willingness to be involved and the availability of the Team members for the entire review process should be secured well in advance. The procedures and charge to the Team must also be communicated prior to the review.
3. The Program Administrator, College Dean, APP, and Dean of Graduate Education (as applicable) establish a schedule for completion of the review.
4. APP, in consultation with the College Dean, Program Administrator, and the Dean of Graduate Education will determine whether an accreditation/recognition review process covers the essential elements of APR in accordance with any CSU or Cal Poly mandated requirements. As appropriate, a supplemental document may be required.
5. The Program Representatives conduct the self-study, and the Program Administrator submits copies of the initial draft of the self-study report to APP, the Associate Dean, and, the Dean of Graduate Education. Feedback on the initial draft is provided to the Program Administrator.
6. The Program Administrator submits a finalized self-study report to APP for distribution to the Team, College Dean, and the Dean of Graduate Education around a month prior to the scheduled site visit.
7. The Team reviews the self-study report, requesting additional materials as needed, and conducts a two-day site visit. The visit is coordinated by the Department, in consultation with the College Dean and APP, and should include meetings with the Program faculty, staff, students, as well as administrators within the Department, College, and University.
8. The Team submits a draft report to APP within one month of the site visit for distribution to the Program. The Program Representatives review the draft for accuracy, and the Program Administrator requests corrections from the Team as necessary.
9. The Team submits the final report (if revisions are required) to APP for distribution to the Program, College Dean, and the Dean of Graduate Education.
10. The Program Representatives draft a strategic action plan based on the findings of the self-study and Team reports. The draft plan is submitted to the Department, the College Dean, APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education.
11. A meeting is scheduled to discuss the draft action plan with the Department, the College Dean, representatives from APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education. Based on input provided during the meeting, revisions are made to the draft plan resulting in a finalized action plan that can be approved by the Dean.
12. The Program Representatives review and the Program Administrator updates the strategic action plan on an annual basis.
13. Copies of all finalized documents are kept on file with APP for two APR cycles.

Adopted:

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

AS-__-18

**RESOLUTION ON MODIFICATIONS TO THE *BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE*
ELECTION OF PART-TIME ACADEMIC EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVE**

- 1 WHEREAS, The participation and voice of part-time lecturers in an academic
2 department/teaching area and part-time employees in Professional
3 Consultative Services, other than those who are members of the
4 General Faculty, is encouraged and valued; and
5
6 WHEREAS, Part-time lecturers in an academic department/teaching area and
7 part-time employees in Professional Consultative Services, other than
8 those who are members of the General Faculty, are represented by
9 one voting member in the Senate; therefore be it
10
11 RESOLVED: That the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be modified as shown on the
12 attached copy.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: January 24, 2018

CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY

ARTICLE III. THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Section 1. Membership

(c) Part-time lecturers in an academic department/teaching area and part-time employees in Professional Consultative Services, other than those who are members of the General Faculty as defined in Article I, will be represented by one voting member in the Senate.

BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

I. INTRODUCTION

B. DEFINITIONS

4. Part-time Academic Employees

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

II. MEMBERSHIP OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

A. ELIGIBILITY

3. Representative of Part-time Academic Employees

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

B. TERMS OF OFFICE

1. Terms of office for senators: the elected term of office for senators shall be two years. A senator can serve a maximum of two consecutive, elected terms and shall not again be eligible for election until one year has elapsed. A senator appointed to fill a temporary vacancy for an elected position shall serve until the completion of that term or until the senator being temporarily replaced returns, whichever occurs first. If this temporary appointment is for one year or less, it shall not be counted as part of the two-term maximum for elected senators. **The representative for part-time academic employees shall start immediately after being elected until elections are held the following academic year.** The representative for part-time academic employees shall serve a one-year term with a maximum of four consecutive one-year terms.

III. VOTING AND ELECTION PROCEDURES

B. ELECTION CALENDAR

8. Election of representative for part-time academic employees:

- (a) during the first weeks of fall quarter, the Academic Senate office shall solicit nominations for the position of Academic Senate representative for part-time academic employees.
- (b) after nominations have been received, election to this position shall be conducted. A runoff election, if needed, shall be conducted the week following the conclusion of the election. Said position shall be elected by vote of all university part-time academic employees unless only one nomination to this position is received, in which case the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall have the authority to appoint said nominee to the position.
- (c) **the elected member shall serve until the end of the academic year elections are held the following academic year.**