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

AS-859-18

RESOLUTION ON PROPOSED ORGANIZATION OF A NEW
UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES DOCUMENT

Impact on Existing Policy: NONE[i]

1 2 3	WHEREAS,	Cal Poly's university-level personnel policies document, the University Faculty Personnel Actions, is limited in scope and out of date; and
4 5 6	WHEREAS,	All faculty units of Cal Poly would benefit from a more comprehensive and adaptable faculty personnel policies document; and
7 8 9	WHEREAS,	AS-829-17 established a procedure for updating personnel policies in coherent and focused elements; and
10 11 12	WHEREAS,	Academic Personnel maintains a centralized repository of all faculty personnel policy documents; therefore, be it
13 14 15 16 17	RESOLVED:	University-level faculty personnel policies be contained in a single document called "University Faculty Personnel Policies" (UFPP) to be housed and accessible to the campus on the Academic Personnel website; and be it further
18 19 20 21	RESOLVED:	UFPP be organized according to the chapter structure in the attached report "Proposed Organization of a New University Faculty Personnel Policies Document;" and be it further
22 23 24 25 26	RESOLVED:	The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee construct UFPP by proposing university-level faculty personnel policies to the Senate in the form of chapters or portions of chapters of UFPP according to the procedures approved in AS-829-17; and be it further
27 28 29	RESOLVED:	By the end of Spring 2020 Colleges and other faculty units reorganize their faculty personnel policy documents to conform their documents to the chapter structure of UFPP.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: October 26, 2018

[i] **(1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.**
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.

**Proposed Organization of a New
University Faculty Personnel Policies Document**

**Faculty Affairs Committee
Fall 2018**

The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC is delegated the responsibility to develop faculty personnel policies and criteria through a joint governance process. The establishment of university-level academic policies through the Academic Senate is in the form of proposing and passing resolutions. When considering substantial changes to faculty policy, the FAC will request the assistance of the deans and college faculty to provide input to draft proposals prior to submission to the Senate for consideration and formal approval.

In Spring 2017 FAC proposed and the Academic Senate passed a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies. This new process specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda. Using the new process, FAC will replace the current University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) document piece by piece to construct a new University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) document. FAC may then update sections of the new UFPP on an as-needed basis. The consent agenda procedure will allow the University to quickly adopt changes that are driven by updates to state law, the Collective Bargaining Agreement, or CSU Policy changes that must be incorporated into our policies.

The guiding principles in revising the UFPA into the new UFPP include clarifying existing policies that are common across the university. Also, faculty evaluation procedures are standardized at the university level. For criteria the university-level policies set baseline expectations and offer guiding principles with directives to the colleges and departments to specify their criteria accordingly attuned to the disciplinary considerations specific to their programs. Colleges and departments would consult the UFPP and cite its provisions in their policy and procedure documents. The college and department personnel policy documents should not duplicate the policies specified in the UFPP and Collective Bargaining Agreement, since the UFPP will be the definitive source for all common policies.

The process for replacing the UFPA with the UFPP will start with the establishment of the general structure of the UFPP in the form of its main chapter divisions, each containing thematically unified selections of policy. Once the structure of the document has been approved by the Academic Senate and the President, FAC will propose to the Senate entire chapters of the document, each covered by its own Senate resolution. In this manner, the Senate will consider thematically unified portions of personnel policy. Once a chapter is approved by the Senate and President, FAC may propose subsequent revisions to the chapters or portions of chapters as needed. Those revisions would move through the Senate using the procedure described above, including the possibility of a consent agenda at the discretion of the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

General Outline of the UFPP

The Faculty Affairs Committee proposes the following general outline of a new University Faculty Personnel Policies document (UFPP):

1. **Preface**
2. **Faculty Appointments**
3. **Personnel Files**
4. **Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes**
5. **Evaluation Processes**
6. **Evaluation Cycle Patterns**
7. **Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria**
8. **Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services**
9. **Evaluation of Professional Development**
10. **Evaluation of Service**
11. **Governance**
12. **Workload**
13. **Appendices**

FAC is proposing that the Senate establish UFPP as the university-level faculty personnel policies document with this organization of chapters. If the Senate approves of this organization of UFPP, FAC would commence with the project of replacing the existing university-level faculty personnel policies by chapter or sub-chapter according to the Senate personnel policy procedures outlined above.

FAC is further proposing that colleges revise their policies documents to adopt the same chapter titles and numbers as UFPP. All faculty personnel policy documents would then conform to a common structure, which facilitates communication about such policies across campus. Colleges would work with Academic Personnel to conform their personnel policy documents to this common form. Once a college has revised its personnel policies document, its departments would then revise their documents into this common form.

Description of the Chapters of the UFPP

1. **Preface**
   The prefatory materials in the document include a general account of the hierarchy of policy in the CSU, the formal statement of the Senate personnel policy revision process, and a general statement of Cal Poly's commitment to the teacher-scholar model. Colleges and departments can put in this section their mission/vision statements, as well as any guiding principles that inform their understanding and implementation of the teacher/scholar model, along with any policies or procedures for revising their policy documents.

2. **Faculty Appointments**
   This chapter provides university-wide hiring policies for all faculty appointments. Policies in this chapter refer to but do not include the more detailed hiring procedures maintained by Academic Personnel. Colleges and departments in their hiring policies

would augment these university-wide policies with their own specific criteria and requirements for faculty appointments.

3. **Personnel Files**
   This chapter defines the requirements and policies for the Personnel Action File (PAF) and Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). It provides a set of general requirements for these documents that colleges and departments may augment to address the discipline specific needs.

4. **Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes**
   Faculty evaluation processes have various definable functions that are common across the university, such as the roles of candidates undergoing evaluation, Department Peer Review Committees, Department Chair/Heads, College Peer Review Committees, and administrators such as the Deans and the Provost. This chapter defines the responsibilities of these roles in faculty evaluation. Colleges and departments may specify additional responsibilities of the various roles within the college or department in faculty evaluation.

5. **Evaluation Processes**
   Standard and familiar evaluation processes include lecturer evaluations and the periodic, retention, promotion, and tenure evaluations of tenure-track faculty. Each of these processes consists of a sequence of different levels of evaluation. The levels of evaluation were defined in Chapter 4, as the responsibilities of various evaluating bodies, such as department and college peer committees, department chairs or heads, or administrative evaluators. This chapter defines all the evaluation sequences allowed for any sort of faculty evaluation currently used by all the colleges. University-level definition of these processes allows for colleges to formulate their policy and procedure documents using common definitions of these processes. The scope of the processes covered in this section includes all faculty evaluation processes including instructional faculty, library faculty, counsellors, and coaches. Exceptions to the normal sequence of evaluation levels are also covered.

6. **Evaluation Cycle Patterns**
   Evaluation cycle patterns are multi-year sequences of annual evaluation processes leading to personnel actions. For instance, the sequence of annual evaluations that lead to retention, promotion, and tenure for tenure-stream faculty comprise an evaluation cycle pattern, as does the sequence of lecturer evaluations that lead towards a three-year contract or range elevation. This chapter defines all evaluation cycle patterns and allows colleges to choose the patterns that best serve their needs and expectations.

7. **Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria**
   This chapter covers the eligibility for personnel actions (including retention, promotion, tenure, range elevation) and the general principles according to which the colleges and departments would specify the criteria for warranting the personnel action. Colleges and departments would expand greatly on these policies with their own criteria mindful of how the diversity of disciplines within the college manifest the teacher/scholar model.

8. **Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services**

   This chapter includes general requirements and guiding principles for how the evaluation of teaching, as well as professional services for non-instructional faculty, should be conducted by evaluating bodies. University level policies for conducting student evaluation of instruction are also included in this section. Colleges and departments would expand on these requirements and apply its principles in concrete guidance and expectations for how teaching would be evaluated. Non-instructional faculty units would do likewise for the evaluation of the relevant professional services.

9. **Evaluation of Professional Development**

   This chapter includes general requirements for how evaluation of professional development should be conducted by evaluating bodies. The function of the professional development plan is the central concern of this chapter, both as constructed by the candidate and as assessed by evaluating bodies so as to guide the candidate towards the next personnel action.

10. **Evaluation of Service**

    This chapter includes general requirements for how the evaluation of service should be conducted by evaluating bodies. Colleges and departments should augment the university expectations to establish expectations about service appropriate to various faculty assignments and ranks.

11. **Governance**

    This chapter sets university level expectations for the definition of academic program governance at the college and department levels. This chapter will include definitions of department leadership as "chairs" or "heads" and university level requirements for defining any changes between those models of department leadership. This chapter also includes university-level policies concerning departmental recommendations to deans for the appointment of department chairs. Colleges and departments would provide more specific policies and procedures in accord with university-level policies. Colleges and departments would also include in their documents any further policies about their governance, including committees within the college and department.

12. **Workload**

    This chapter includes policies covering various aspects of faculty workload, including office hours, assigned time, and policies pertaining to FERP or PRTB workload.

13. **Appendices**

    This chapter is reserved for supplemental materials related to faculty personnel policies. One appendix will be the current version of the University Faculty Personnel Actions document, portions of which remain in effect until superseded by sections of the UFPP. Colleges and departments may include any number of supplementary documents as appendices, such as summary worksheets, schedules, checklists.

Consultation with Faculty Units about UFPP

The need for consultation with faculty units for such a universal body of policy is obvious. In establishing Senate procedures for personnel policies FAC proposed a uniform set of expectations about such consultation requiring that any affected units be appropriately informed about the proposed change and be able to offer feedback on the proposal. FAC is then obliged by these procedures to include the nature of this feedback to the Senate with the proposal.

Over the course of several weeks in Spring and Summer 2018, Ken Brown (chair of FAC) and Al Liddicoat (Vice Provost of Academic Personnel) visited with every college council to discuss this proposed overhaul of the university personnel policies document. They explained how the old UFPA would be superseded by the new UFPP document. They laid out the new Senate procedure that would be used to create and then revise UFPP. The presentation included an earlier draft of this very report. They received feedback on the spot at those meetings from department chairs and heads, Associate Deans, and the Deans. Ken left the colleges with a feedback form (attached at the end of this report) for the college to compile feedback and send it back to FAC by the beginning of October. This timeframe for feedback allowed the college leadership to bring the topic to their departments at the beginning of Fall. They also noted that the scope of this feedback should be limited to the overall structure of UFPP, its proposed chapter breakdown, and the overall project of revising these policies, noting that the proposed text of each chapter would follow as individual items for their own comparable and suitable level of consultative feedback. (The nature of the proposed changes to university policy affects the non-instructional units far less than to the colleges, and FAC has been made aware of recent changes to policy documents from, for instance, the Library.)

From this useful feedback, FAC has made some notable changes to the proposed structure of the document. College councils will again be informed of this proposal when it is put on the Senate agenda so further feedback can be directed through their Senators.

Changes to Existing Policy

This proposed change includes no policy, but instead establishes the structure of a policy document. The changes to the policy language will come when FAC proposes chapters that fill out this policy document.

Implementation

At this stage of establishing the structure of UFPP there is no implementation of policy, since this proposal includes no policy, but only the chapter structure of the subsequent policy document. Implementation in this case amounts to the project of the colleges, and in turn of departments, to conform the structure of their personnel policy documents to the uniform structure of policy documents set by the UFPP. This implementation should conform with the timeframe set in the resolution to which this report is attached.

Feedback for Faculty Affairs Committee

College:

Main contact for further information about this feedback:
    Name:
    Position:
    Email:

The FAC is considering having colleges and departments structure their personnel policy documents with the same chapter divisions of the proposed UFPPP.[1] Note that a department policy and procedure document could defer to its college's policies and procedures on any topic. **Please indicate whether and how this change in the organization of faculty personnel policy and procedure documents would affect your college and departments.**

Please identify and describe any other topics addressed in your college or department level personnel policies and procedures documents that seem not to fit into any of the proposed chapters for the new UFPPP listed and described above.**

Please offer any questions or feedback about the proposed organizational structure of the new UFPPP.

When the Faculty Affairs Committee solicits feedback from colleges about drafts of the chapters of the proposed UFPPP, information about the proposed new policies would be sent to the Dean to be distributed to Associate Deans, Analysts in the Dean's office, Department Chairs/Heads, and any faculty committee tasked with considering matters of personnel policy in the college. **Are there other methods that should be used to solicit feedback from your college?**

The project of replacing the old UFPA with the new UFPPP is more about the clarification of existing policy and involves little change to existing policy. Any revision to a policy document raises reasonable questions about the status of those policies. **Please offer any general feedback or concerns in your college or departments about university level personnel policies and their relationship to your college and department level policies.**

Please email this document with any feedback from your college to the Faculty Affairs Committee chair, Ken Brown (dbrown07@calpoly.edu) by October 1, 2018.

---

[1] When this feedback document was circulated to the colleges, the FAC was proposing a document called University Faculty Personnel Policies *and Procedures*. Based on feedback from the colleges, FAC dropped the reference in the title to procedures.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MEMORANDUM

To: Dustin Stegner

From: Jeffery D Armstrong

Date: January 11, 2019

Copies: K. Enz Finken
M. Pedersen
A. Liddicoat
K. Brown
College Deans

Subject: Response to AS-859-18 Resolution on Proposed Organization of a New University Faculty Personnel Policies Document

This memo acknowledges my support and approval of the above-entitled Academic Senate resolution. The University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP), as outlined in the resolution and supporting documentation, will lay out the framework for the revision of the university, college and department personnel policies ostensibly streamlining the current process. Furthermore, the provost is recommending the colleges begin restructuring their personnel policies this year to align with the UFPP outline so that they can be approved this summer for implementation in fall 2019. The final deadline for restructuring is fall 2020 as noted in the resolution. It is important to note that the colleges are not expected to update their policies at this time—instead they simply need to reorder their existing policies. Once the colleges have restructured their personnel documents, it will be easier to reference the college and department specific criteria in relation to the UFPP.

Please express my appreciation to the Academic Senate members and the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee for their attention to this important matter.