Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, April 28, 2020
https://calpoly.zoom.us/j/412386620

I. Minutes: April 7, 2020 and April 14, 2020 minutes (pp. 2-5)

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

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office: None
C. Provost: None
D. Statewide Senate: None
E. CFA: (p. 6)
F. ASI: (p. 7)

IV. Special Reports:

V. Business Item(s):
A. Appointment of Matt Beekman, Physics, as substitute for Thomas Gutierrez on the Academic Senate for the 2020-2021 academic year
B. Resolution on Online Teaching and Learning: Brian Greenwood (pp. 8-19)
C. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Subchapter 8.4.5: Student Evaluation Results: Ken Brown, Academic Senate Faculty Affairs (pp. 20-25)
D. Resolution on Posting Accessible Course Materials: John Hagen, Instruction Committee Chair (pp. 26-28)
E. Resolution on the Marketing of Cal Poly’s Educational Identity and Goals: Gary Laver (pp. 29-30)
F. Temporary Suspension of Sections of Executive Order 1037 - Grading Symbols, Minimum Standards Governing the Assignment of Grades, Policies on the Repetition of Courses, Policies on Academic Renewal, and Grade Appeals: Dustin Stegner

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, April 7, 2020
3:10 to 5:00pm
https://calpoly.zoom.us/j/727747440

I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve the February 18, 2020 Academic Senate Executive Committee minutes.

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

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: none.
B. President’s Office: none.
C. Provost: none.
D. Statewide Senate: Refer to pages 5-10 of agenda packet.
E. CFA: Refer to page 11 of agenda packet.
F. ASI: Refer to page 12 in agenda packet.

IV. Business Item(s):
A. Review and Consider “University Faculty Personnel Policies Appendix: Administrative Memos to Appear as Consent Agenda Item. Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, asked that the Executive Committee allow University Faculty Personnel Policies Appendix: Administrative Memos to be considered on the consent agenda rather than as a business item to create a more streamlined process. M/S/P to create consent agenda item.

B. Resolution on the Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Instruction for Winter and Spring Quarters 2020. Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, introduced a resolution that would allow faculty to exclude either or both winter and spring quarter 2020 student evaluations and grade distribution information from their PAF and WPAF due to the sudden changes in instruction caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. No motion was made.

C. Resolution on Suspending eLearning Addenda. Brian Self, Curriculum Committee Chair, proposed a resolution that would suspend the requirement for eLearning addendum for faculty who wish to teach their courses virtually in summer and fall quarter 2020. M/S/P to agendize the resolution.

D. Resolution on Posting Accessible Course Materials. John Hagen, Instruction Committee Chair, presented a resolution asking faculty to post course materials within the learning management system (LMS) on a Cal Poly Drupal site in order to improve accessibility. M/S/P to postpone this resolution to the April 28, 2020, Executive Committee meeting.

E. Resolution to Adopt ORCID for Improved Identification and Connection among Researchers. Keri Schwab, Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Committee Chair, introduced a resolution asking the Academic Senate to support Cal Poly’s adoption of ORCID, a platform that allows researchers to connect and share grants, publications and much more, and encourage faculty to enroll and create an ORCID ID. M/S/P to agendize the resolution.

F. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 7. Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, proposed a resolution establishing University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 7: Personnel Actions Eligibility and Criteria. M/S/P to agendize the resolution.
G. **Resolution on Revisions to University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 4.** Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, presented a resolution revising University Faculty Personal Policies Chapter 4: UFPP 4 Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Process. M/S/P to agendize the resolution.

H. **Memo to President Armstrong on suspending eLearning addenda for summer quarter 2020.** Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, introduced a memorandum to President Armstrong explaining the Executive Committee’s stance on suspending eLearning addenda for summer quarter 2020. The memo suggests that newly online courses be held only to the regular curricular review process due to sudden changes in instruction caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. M/S/P to approve and send the memo.

V. **Discussion Item(s):** none.

VI. **Adjournment:** 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by,

Katie Terou

Katie Terou
Academic Senate Student Assistant
Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, April 14, 2020
3:10 to 4:00pm
https://calpoly.zoom.us/j/727747440

I. Minutes: none.

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

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: none.
B. President’s Office: none.
C. Provost: none.
D. Statewide Senate: none.
E. CFA: none.
F. ASI: none.

IV. Business Item(s):
A. Approval of 2020-2021 Calendar of Meetings. M/S/P to approve the 2020-2021 Calendar of Meetings with the amendment of the November 17, 2020, and March 9, 2021, meetings being “if needed” rather than required. The calendar of meetings is on page 2 of the agenda packet, which is available here.


C. Appointment of substitute for Emily White in Academic Senate for spring quarter 2020. M/S/P to appoint Brian Osborn, Architecture, as a substitute for Emily White to represent CAED for spring quarter 2020.

D. Appointment of substitute for Michael McCullough in Academic Senate Curriculum Committee for spring quarter 2020. M/S/P to appoint Amy Lammert, Food Science and Nutrition, as a substitute for Michael McCullough to represent CAFES on the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee for spring quarter 2020.


F. Appointments to Academic Senate Committees for the 2020-2022 term. M/S/P to approve the following appointments to Academic Senate Committees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences</th>
<th>Dawn Neill, Social Sciences</th>
<th>Grants Review Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy Lammer, Food Science</td>
<td>Sara Lopus, Social Sciences</td>
<td>Instruction Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana Huzey, Animal Science</td>
<td>Jason Peters, English</td>
<td>Sustainability Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis Castro, Food Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Architecture and Environmental Design</td>
<td>College of Science and Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Watts, Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Lars Tomanek, Biology</td>
<td>DSA Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>Eric Kantorowski, Chemistry</td>
<td>DTA Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Braun, Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Marilyn Tseng, Kinesiology</td>
<td>Diversity Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>John Jabinesk, Physics</td>
<td>GE Governance Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Kolodziejki, Comms</td>
<td>Shianju Zhang, Chemistry</td>
<td>Grants Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Bohr, Social Sciences</td>
<td>Jonathan Fernsler, Physics</td>
<td>Sustainability Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy Chand, Theatre &amp; Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dustin Stegner, English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

805-756-1258 ~~ academiconsenate.calpoly.edu
G. **Appointments to University Committees for the 2020-2021 academic year.** M/S/P to approve the following appointments to University Committees:

- **College of Liberal Arts**
  - Lauren Kolodziejki, Comms
  - Ashley McDonald, Chemistry

- **College of Science and Mathematics**
  - Orfalea College of Business
  - College of Science and Mathematics
  - Bing Anderson, Finance
  - Ashley McDonald, Chemistry
  - Intellectual Property

- **Faculty Affairs Committee**
  - Eduardo Zambrano, Economics
  - Javier de la Fuente, ITP

- **Grants Review Committee**
  - Professional Consultative Services
  - Brett Bodemer, Library

- **V. Discussion Item(s):** none.

- **VI. Adjournment:** 4:10 p.m.

Submitted by,

**Katie Terou**

Katie Terou
Academic Senate Student Assistant
SUMMER 2020. Our local Summer Quarter agreement remains in effect. A full-time Summer teaching assignment will consist of 12 WTU for tenured and tenure-track faculty, and 15 WTU for lecturers. Across the University (and preferably within each college and department), 60% of Summer teaching offers (by headcount) should be made to tenured and tenure-track faculty. Up to 40% of Summer teaching offers may be made to lecturers. However, if some tenured or tenure-track faculty decline offers of Summer teaching, then lecturer appointments may make up more than 40% of Summer teaching assignments. Department heads and chairs will have received a list of faculty who are eligible to teach in Summer from Academic Personnel. If a department wants to offer a particular class and no eligible faculty are available to teach that class, the department chair or head may request an eligibility waiver from their Dean’s Office.

CSU COVID-19 PAID ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE. The CSU has authorized paid administrative leave for employees who are unable to work due to COVID-19. An employee may use up to 256 hours of paid administrative leave. This leave can be combined with other types of leave such as sick leave. Faculty who wish to apply for paid administrative leave should notify their department chair/head and Academic Personnel.
ASI President Report:

- **ASI Election Results**: I am pleased to congratulate the following student leaders for their election to their respective positions. A more comprehensive list of the election results can be found [here].
  - ASI President
    - Shayna Lynch, Political Science
  - ASI Board of Directors
    - College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences — 4 seats
      - Hayley Fernandes
      - Armando Nevarez
      - Sujhey Rosas
      - Samantha Santos
    - College of Architecture and Environmental Design — 3 seats
      - Alexander Ameri
      - Diana Fierro Gonzalez
      - Mitchell Wexler
    - College of Engineering — 5 seats
      - Ricky Chavez
      - Alan Faz
      - Suha Hussain
      - Tess Loarie
      - Jordan Perlas
    - College of Liberal Arts — 4 seats
      - Neila Consuelo Patino
      - Jordy Roth
      - Parker Swanson
      - Amanda Tejeda
    - College of Science and Mathematics — 4 seats
      - Michelle Deyski
      - Perla Estrada
      - McKenna Grant
      - Sam Park
    - Orfalea College of Business — 4 seats
      - Katia Espinoza
      - Marissa Hiji
      - Melody Lee
      - Tom Lee
RESOLUTION ON ONLINE TEACHING & LEARNING

WHEREAS, A previous resolution related to online teaching and learning, AS-750-12: Resolution on eLearning Policy, is seven years old, and;

WHEREAS, Online education and technology-mediated instruction is rapidly evolving in all its forms, sparking the need to periodically reevaluate campus policies and procedures.

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Task Force on Online Teaching & Learning and the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee have endorsed the attached policy entitled “Online Teaching & Learning Policy at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo;” therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate adopt the following Online Teaching & Learning Policy at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo document.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Online Teaching and Learning Task Force
Date: April 28, 2020
Online Teaching & Learning Policy

at

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Preamble

This policy is an update of the prior “eLearning Policy at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo” adopted through AS-750-12: Resolution on eLearning Policy on May 29, 2012. For policy items that the task force deemed current, those policies have remained intact and are included below with only minor updates.

Over the course of the last two decades, online education internationally, nationally, and in California has expanded rapidly with institutions of higher education investing time, energy, and resources into developing comprehensive offerings for students at the course and degree level. With advances in technology coupled with growing need for flexibility in higher education, both hybrid and fully online courses have become more prevalent at Cal Poly. With that prevalence has come the need to update and simplify the curriculum approval process, remove the e-Learning Addendum, and more fully integrate the review of online modalities into the regular process of curricular review.

The Online Teaching & Learning Task Force was convened to address the concerns that have been brought by faculty from across the university, with the hope that this resolution will serve to streamline the process while at the same time ensuring accountability and rigor in the offering of online education.

Modality Designations

One of the first targeted areas was to establish clear definitions related to modalities (i.e., methods of delivery) for online teaching and learning instruction. This is not to be confused with
modes of delivery, as Cal Poly officially has six recognized *modes* of delivery to include: *lecture, lab, activity, discussion, seminar,* and *supervision.*

With our standing as one of 23 universities in the California State University (CSU), and considering the CSU’s stated commitment to online education through the CSU Fully Online Course Match program, it is natural to look to others in the system and the CSU Academic Senate to aid in that goal of defining the associated modalities involved with online instruction. The CSU Academic Senate approved AS-3169-14/AA (Rev): *Designation and Compilation of Course Modalities* on May 16, 2014. Therefore, we adopt the following CSU course modality (i.e., methods of delivery) definitions with the additional caveat that updates to these definitions be adopted in step with the CSU Academic Senate:

A. *Face-to-Face Course, Traditional (FT)* - Instruction is conducted in real time, with student(s) and faculty present in the same location. May use a course management system or web pages to post the syllabus and assignments. Scheduled in-person face-to-face class sessions are not normally replaced with online activities. A course in which less than twenty-five percent (25%) may be taught in an online fashion.

B. *Face-to-Face Course, Online (FO)* - Instruction is conducted via the Internet. Some instruction occurs in real time, with student(s) and faculty in different physical locations. May use web-conferencing software to hold class meetings. A course in which 100% of the course activities take place online.

C. *Local Course, Online (LO)* - Instruction occurs over the Internet (asynchronously). Scheduled face-to-face meetings may be required for orientation, exams, and student evaluation. A course in which such in-person face-to-face meetings do not exceed twenty-five percent (25%) of the course activities.

D. *Remote Course, Online (RO)* - Instruction is conducted over the Internet asynchronously, with students and instructors working at separate times and in different physical locations. A course in which 100% of the course activities take place online.

E. *Hybrid Course (HY)* - Instruction using a blend of traditional and online methods. Typically, these courses are a mixture of online and face-to-face sessions; such sessions
may or may not occur in real time. A course in which at least 25% of the course activities
take place online, and which does not meet the definition of an FO, LO or RO course.

F. **Flexible Course (FL)** - Course allows for more than one modality; students choose the
modality (or modalities) suiting their needs from instructor-identified options.

New course proposals/modifications shall specify the mode and modality, which establishes the
expected contact hours or their equivalent (see “Credit Hour Policy” below).

**Credit Hours**

In compliance with federal and WSCUC requirements as well as CSU Coded Memo AA-2011-
14, Cal Poly has a credit hour policy requiring the following:

1. One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-
of-class student work each week for ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit; or

2. At least an equivalent amount of work for other academic activities as established by the
institution, including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other
academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

In practice, this means that, for each unit of credit, a FT course in lecture/seminar mode must
engage the student for one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two
hours of out-of-class student work each week, for a total of 30 hours each quarter. For each unit
of credit, a FT course in activity mode requires two hours of instruction and one hour of out-of-
class work, while a FT course in laboratory mode requires three hours of instruction and no out-
of-class work.

In courses with modalities that include online instruction (FO, LO, RO, HY, & FL), direct
faculty instruction takes the place of classroom time, and a credit hour may be measured by an
equivalent amount of direct instruction (e.g., text-based learning modules, asynchronous
screencast lectures, lecture transcripts, recorded podcasts, assigned videos, faculty-mediated
asynchronous or synchronous discussions, quizzes/exams, etc.). The equivalent for out-of-class
work is very similar to that provided in the FT modality (e.g., assigned reading, homework
problems, non-faculty mediated discussion board posts, individual/group projects, papers, service-learning, etc.). Proposals for online courses should address these credit-hour requirements, assuring that the courses in their proposed modes and modalities will entail the equivalent hours of instruction or out-of-class work.

**Faculty Responsibility for Curricular and Quality Control**

Cal Poly faculty have the collective and exclusive responsibility for determining the pedagogies, instructional methods, and best practices most appropriate for their instructional modules, courses, and academic programs (pursuant to administrative assurance of resources).

At the department and program level, faculty with expertise in their respective disciplines are empowered to make decisions regarding the curriculum and present such decisions to the college and university levels for further review and approval. These decisions include those regarding the appropriate mode and modality for instruction.

For each of the listed modalities defined previously, a corresponding code will be developed in the Cal Poly online curriculum system in conjunction with the Registrar’s Office and with the intention that the modality be populated accordingly to inform students in advance of the modality being offered.

For approval of all new courses moving forward, these modalities will be integrated into the approval process with accompanying questions being required irrespective of the modality that is chosen.

In lieu of an eLearning Addendum (see Removal of eLearning Addendum below), the following standardized questions should be included under the current Course Delivery and Resources section in all new course proposals and course modifications (note that course learning objectives [CLOs] are required for all new course proposals, and course modifications will include a question addressing whether will continue to be an integral element included:

1. What is the primary modality in which the course is intended to be taught?
2. Indicate other modalities in which the course is intended to be taught.

*Note. All modalities that are defined above will be populated and defined here.*

*These questions will replace the current two questions that are nearly identical in wording but with options for In-Person, Hybrid, Online, and Other.*

To maintain accreditation standards and quality curricular control, please answer the following questions about direct instruction and out-of-class work (or its equivalent for online): *Note. Hours estimate should be on a weekly basis*

1. Hours of face-to-face instruction (*may include instruction through web-conferencing software such as Zoom, Skype, Microsoft Teams, or its equivalent*):
2. Briefly describe planned methods of direct instruction face-to-face (*e.g., lecture, discussion, small group problem-solving, videos, demonstrations, etc.*):
3. Hours of direct instruction online:
4. Briefly describe planned methods of direct instruction online (*e.g., text-based learning modules, asynchronous screencast lectures, lecture transcripts, recorded podcasts, assigned videos, faculty-mediated asynchronous or synchronous discussions, quizzes/exams, etc.*):
5. Hours of out-of-class work or its equivalent for online:
6. Briefly describe planned methods for engaging students in out-of-class work or its equivalent for online (*e.g., assigned reading, homework problems, non-faculty mediated discussion board posts, individual/group projects, papers, service-learning, etc.*):

In addition, course proposal and course modification forms should include the following for all modalities:

1. Include the course learning objectives (CLOs) and assessment methods designed to measure attainment of CLOs.
2. Please include a list of measures that will be employed to ensure academic integrity in the assessment of students’ attainment of the CLOs.
3. Indicate the names of faculty members who will initially teach the course, and if one (or more) of the online modalities (FO, RO, LO, HY, & FL) are being proposed, please briefly provide their prior online experience and/or training.

It should be noted that courses and their accompanying modes and modalities are approved at the university level, not the faculty who propose and/or teach the courses. Departments should carefully consider those who are assigned to teach any course but particularly those within the online modalities due to the specialized skills required.

Faculty who are assigned to teach and/or develop courses with online modalities (FO, RO, LO, HY, & FL) are strongly encouraged to either have prior online pedagogical experience and/or engage in appropriate training.

There are various offerings of online education training and certification, and opportunities for engagement change rapidly. Rather than endorse any one set of criteria or standard, we recommend that faculty consult with Cal Poly’s Center for Teaching, Learning & Technology (CTLT) and the California State University’s (CSU) Quality Assurance Program (including the associated “Core 24” objectives) for the latest in professional development related to online education (applies to both initial and ongoing development of online modalities).

Cal Poly’s Center for Teaching, Learning & Technology: https://ctlt.calpoly.edu/

California State University’s (CSU) Quality Assurance Program: http://courseredesign.csuprojects.org/wp/qualityassurance/qlt-informal-review/

**Removal of eLearning Addendum**

Previously, course modifications that involved a change in the modality beyond the 51% threshold of contact time (i.e., face-to-face) required an additional eLearning Addendum. That is no longer the requirement per this resolution. However, it should still be noted that any change in the modality (defined previously above) of an existing course from the modalities listed in the original course proposal must involve a course modification.
**Accessibility**

For all courses, irrespective of modality, course materials must be accessible and comply with state and federal laws and guidelines. Instructors offering courses in online modalities are required to make sure all course materials are accessible. This includes using videos with closed captions, documents created with accessibility features such as Word Styles and PDF tags, and accessible Canvas content.

Additionally, instructors are encouraged to utilize SensusAccess, a free software tool available to Cal Poly students, staff and instructors, which can provide alternative formats of electronic materials, such as converting a PDF file to MP3 format. Cal Poly will soon be integrating Blackboard ALLY into the Canvas LMS. ALLY will identify inaccessible course content within the LMS and provide guidance to fix issues. ALLY provides alternative formats of course materials, similar to SensusAccess, and includes translations to other languages as well. As technology and standards evolve, instructors utilizing technology-mediated instruction in any capacity are highly encouraged to maintain currency in accessibility standards and utilize the appropriate means/methods to ensure equitable access for all students.

For more information, see the California State University Board of Trustees Policy on Disability Support and Accommodations; Executive Order (EO) 1111 at: [https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/6590867/latest/](https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/6590867/latest/)

**University Resource Responsibilities**

Information Technology Services (ITS), Robert E. Kennedy Library, CTLT, and other university agencies may be called upon to provide necessary resources and services for the successful implementation of online education courses and programs.

These resources and services include:

1. **Student Training.** Where applicable, the University will provide training in online education technology and use to students through web-based resources and virtual instruction.
2. **Faculty Training.** Where applicable, the University will provide training in the use of online education technologies and pedagogy to faculty through face-to-face workshops (if feasible), web-based resources, and virtual instruction.

3. **Technical Support.** Where applicable, the University will provide help desk services, account maintenance, software and hardware assistance, etc., as needed to support online education courses and programs.

4. **Testing Services.** Where applicable, the University will provide access to appropriate test proctoring services either via a physical location and/or virtual means aligned with best practices as defined by the California State University’s (CSU) Quality Assurance Program. These testing services should include adequate safeguards designed to aid faculty in ensuring academic integrity for online education courses and programs.

5. **Information and Facility Services.** The University will provide adequate access to library resources, laboratories, facilities, and equipment appropriate to online education courses and programs.

6. **Student Services.** The University will provide adequate access to the range of student services appropriate to support online education courses and programs, including admissions, financial aid, academic advising, and placement and counseling.

7. **Student Evaluations.** The University should collaborate with faculty to develop and deploy student evaluation tools for online education courses that are consistent with the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement.

**Assessment of Online Education Courses and Programs**

Criteria for assessing the quality and efficacy of online education-based instruction shall be developed by the academic units from which the instruction originates. Online education courses, sections, and programs shall be held to the same standards as traditional classroom instruction when reviewed by department, college, and university program review committees.
Program review committees shall evaluate the educational effectiveness of online education courses (including assessments of student-based learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction), and when appropriate, determine comparability to courses taught only in a face-to-face traditional classroom modality. This process shall also be used to assure the conformity of online education courses and programs to prevailing online education quality standards, and as standards evolve, the appropriate standards for quality online teaching and learning should be utilized for assessment. Ultimately, online education courses and programs shall be consistent with the educational missions and strategic plans of the department, college, and university.

**Contracting and the Use of Outside Resources**

The University shall not agree in a contract with any private or public entity to deliver or receive online education courses or programs for academic credit without the prior approval of the relevant department and college. In addition, all such contracts must be in compliance with the relevant University policies and guidelines. The impetus for such a contract shall originate with the Cal Poly faculty, who would decide whether there is an instructional need and how best to fill it. As part of its review of online education-based courses within the scope of this policy document, the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee in conjunction with ITS shall determine the suitability of hosting course materials on non-university facilities.

**Intellectual Property Rights**

Ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues, and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, courseware, or other media products shall be agreed upon by the faculty and the University prior to the initial offering of an online education course or program, in accordance with established CSU and Cal Poly policies and the collective bargaining agreement.
Admissions

Admissions criteria for online education-based courses shall be the same as for traditional face-to-face courses. Agencies providing funding for online education courses or programs shall not acquire any privileges regarding the admission standards, academic continuation standards, or degree requirements for students or faculty.

Course Descriptions and Advertising Guidelines

Faculty and students have a right to know the modalities and technological requirements of each course, program, and degree offered by the University. This information will be communicated to students in all relevant communications. Publicized descriptions of online education courses (e.g., in PASS) shall note the modality according to the definitions listed above.

Impact on Faculty Personnel Decisions

Faculty personnel decisions (hiring, retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review) should value and reward course and curriculum development and professional development activities that result in improved instruction. However, no ranking of instructional methodologies or modalities is to be used as a basis for personnel decisions. The role and value of online education should be made explicit in the personnel policies of departments and colleges.

Online Education Course and Program Funding

Funding sources for the development of online education courses and programs shall be explicitly stated in all online education-based course and program proposals. Funding sources may include any combination of grants, self-support, private contributions, and state support. The originating department shall develop the funding source proposal through traditional means and shall make a recommendation to the Academic Senate as to the suitability and viability of the proposed funding source. If applicable, such proposals shall include funding for the services of an instructional designer.
Use of Online Education Technologies is Optional

Nothing in this policy shall imply that online education is a preferred or required method of instruction. Implementation of this policy must comply with existing campus policies and collective bargaining agreements where applicable (e.g., workload and faculty rights). It should also be explicitly noted that faculty may not be required to teach more students in an online modality than they would be assigned to teach in a face-to-face modality.

Furthermore, this policy is only applicable to new courses and course modifications with a modality change and is not meant to restrict or rigidly control the general use of online education technology in the classroom.

Applicability of this Policy

This policy shall apply to all new and existing credit-bearing courses and programs offered by Cal Poly.
RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
SUBCHAPTER 8.4.5: STUDENT EVALUATION RESULTS

Impact on Existing Policy: This resolution establishes new policy. Its impact on existing practice is described in the attached report. ¹

WHEREAS, Student evaluation data are collected and used for the purpose of providing student feedback as part of the evidence considered in the evaluation of teaching in periodic and performance evaluations of instructional faculty; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly has no policies on the disposition of student evaluation data beyond their practical use in the evaluation of teaching performance as part of periodic and performance evaluations of instructional faculty; and

WHEREAS, Colleges and departments have established their own varied practices of removing out of date student evaluation data from faculty Personnel Action Files (PAF); and

WHEREAS, University policy on document storage and disposition of student evaluation results would eliminate variation across campus about how student evaluation results are maintained in the PAF; and

WHEREAS, Electronic storage of student evaluation data has changed the practices of document disposition without any consideration by the Academic Senate about the value of standardizing longstanding practice of disposition of student evaluation results from the PAF; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The policy document contained at the end of the attached report “Proposed University Faculty Personnel Policies Subchapter 8.4.5: Student Evaluation Results” be established as university policy, and be it further
RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library revise their personnel policy documents prior to Fall 2020 to conform with subchapter 8.4.5 of UFPP.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: April 28, 2020

(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 University Faculty Personnel Policies

SUBCHAPTER 8.4.5: Student Evaluation Results

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 employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies which 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. FAC has used this process to construct a new University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) document and is now employing the same process to create and revise personnel policies to UFPP on an as-needed basis.

In creating UFPP FAC has adopted a guiding principle that, as far as possible, the migration of existing personnel policies from the former governing personnel policies document, University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA), into UFPP shall not change those policies as they are in UFPA, but instead just reformulate them into the new style and structure of UFPP. Once the policies previously in UFPA are in place in UFPP, FAC may then visit them for subsequent revision in the form of presenting to the Academic Senate revisions to chapters and sections of UFPP. FAC may also propose wholly new policies to be included in UFPP.

This report explains and justifies a proposed new personnel policy. The proposed new policies are addenda to the policies already in UFPP 8.4.5.

FAC engaged in consultation with the colleges about the proposed policy, presenting two options for the proposed policy. The policy presented here arose from the one option universally preferred by those who provided feedback.

Summary of Subchapter 8.4.5 Student Evaluation Results

Per article 15.15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), results of student evaluations are stored as an electronic extension of a faculty member’s Personnel Action File (PAF). Student evaluation reports comprise part of the body of evidence relevant to the evaluation teaching performance in faculty evaluation processes. Results of student evaluations contribute to the assessment of the faculty member’s teaching performance as recorded in the AP109 form used by the Department Peer Review Committee and Department Chairs/Heads. These AP109 forms remain in the PAF forming a history of faculty evaluation, including the evaluation of teaching performance.

The proposed policy defines student evaluation results as the reports generated for each course evaluated, including a complete accounting of the quantitative responses and all the student comments from a given class section of a course. Filing and storage of student evaluation results amounts to filing and storage of these reports. The remaining policy text addresses the disposition of those reports beyond the period of their utility. Some background about the utility of these reports of student evaluation results is in order.

Given the validation of the quality of teaching inherent in the granting of tenure and post-tenure promotion, and in issuance and renewal of lecturer faculty contracts, the continued evaluation of teaching beyond these personnel actions is in reference to the summary assessment of teaching covered in the evaluation reports that recommended those personnel actions. The evidence of
teaching under consideration in a subsequent post-tenure evaluation is assessed in reference to prior assessments of teaching performance in the reports issued from prior evaluations, but the evidence in support of those prior summary assessments is not something to revisit in subsequent evaluations.

When student evaluations were conducted with paper forms, student evaluation records consisted of summary reports of the quantitative results and the original paper forms containing each student’s comments collected in the student evaluation process. Both those summary reports and the original paper forms with student comments were, by the CBA, considered to be part of the PAF. The summary reports were standardly filed in the PAF secured in the dean’s office, while the original paper forms were typically stored in department offices, officially by the CBA as an extension of the PAF.

The storage of the original student evaluation forms provided practical limitations on how long those paper documents would remain available as an extension of a PAF. To make room for storage of recent student evaluation forms, ones no longer relevant to the active cycles of faculty evaluation would routinely be returned to the faculty member, and thus be purged from the PAF. In the absence of any policy on the disposition of student evaluation documents the purging of original student evaluation data including student comments varied across campus. Yet, the practice, in some form or other, of purging the data from the PAF was widespread.

The use of electronic storage of student evaluation data, and especially the electronic collection of such data across campus since Fall 2016, has allowed student evaluations to remain in an electronic extension of a faculty member’s PAF virtually in perpetuity, and therefore beyond the period of their utility in evaluating faculty teaching quality. The absence of university policy governing the disposition of such data coupled with the elimination of any storage based need to purge outdated student evaluation data, in effect, creates a change away from accepted practice, and amounts to the construction of new policy by mere omission of prior policy, and without any action by the Academic Senate.

*FAC therefore recommends that university policy establish that student evaluation reports be retained for the period of their utility in faculty evaluation, and then removed from the PAF as they lose that utility.*

This recommendation is limited to the official reports of student evaluation results including the entire body of student evaluation data and the comments from students for a given class taught by that faculty member. Colleges and departments may summarize student evaluation results and record those summaries in other documents (e.g. comprehensive records of teaching assignments) that remain in the PAF independent of any provision of the proposed policy options under consideration.

This proposed policy requires a faculty member’s PAF to be purged of student evaluation reports after six academic years. That period of time covers the normal probationary period for tenure-track faculty, overlaps with the standard period of post-tenure evaluation, covers the standard period of evaluation prior to the establishment of a three-year contract for lecturer faculty, and overlaps the period of two successive three-year contracts.

In certain cases there may be some utility in retaining student evaluation data for longer periods. The CBA allows faculty to place items in their own PAF, and allows administrators to place items in a faculty
The decision of a faculty member, or of a department chair/head or dean, to retain student evaluation results for a longer period is therefore allowed. But, the default in the absence of a positive action to retain the data would be to purge it after six academic years.

**Impact on Existing Policy**

The proposed policy governs how Deans serve as the custodians of a faculty member’s PAF. The policy conforms with existing CSU policies about document retention and disposition. Student evaluation reports are documents with legal standing as elements of personnel files. CSU policies about document disposition of legal files as well as the secure deletion of data would prevail in the execution of the provisions of this policy.

The proposed policy conforms with the Collective Bargaining Agreement which specifies that results of student evaluations be placed in the PAF, and that this placement may be in the form of electronic storage. The CBA is silent about how long such results must remain in the PAF. The CBA allows for filing and removal of items from the PAF both from the faculty member and administrators.

In framing our ideas about how to draft the new policy, FAC considered similar policies that have been in place for a while at SDSU.

**Implementation**

This policy would go into effect the next academic year. Its implementation requires the purge of obsolete student evaluations from the PAFs of all those faculty who have met the conditions for the purge of those documents. The exact process and timing of document disposal amounts to an administrative task. It should happen in summer so the student evaluation data are fixed for the upcoming academic year. Further clarification of the administrative side of implementing this policy may warrant additions or revisions to this subchapter down the line.

What follows is the text of UFPP subchapter 8.4.5.1 and 8.4.5.2, which remain as they are, followed by new policy starting at 8.4.5.3. ...
8.4.5. **Student Evaluation Results**

8.4.5.1. Placement of student evaluation results in Personnel Action Files is governed by CBA 11.1, 15.15, 15.17.

8.4.5.2. Results of student evaluations shall be stored in electronic format and incorporated by extension into the Personnel Action File. The dean is the custodian of the PAF and will provide secure access to this information.

8.4.5.3. Results of student evaluations consist of reports generated for each course evaluated, including a complete accounting of the quantitative responses and all the student comments from a given class section of a course. Policies about filing, storage, and disposition of student evaluation results concern only these reports of student evaluation results.

8.4.5.4. Colleges and departments may summarize or extract selected quantitative student evaluation data into other reports about the teaching history of a faculty member that the college or department may require to be included in the PAF. Any extraction of student evaluation data into other reports for the PAF must be defined in the college or department personnel policies.

8.4.5.5. Results of student evaluations shall only be retained in the PAF for the prior six complete academic years.

8.4.5.6. Results of student evaluations may be maintained in the PAF for longer periods on request of the faculty member, the department chair/head, or the dean.

8.4.5.7. Absent a request to retain them, results of student evaluations from classes taught earlier than the prior six complete academic years shall be removed from the PAF, following standard CSU procedures for legal document disposition. The removal of results of student evaluations from the PAF shall normally occur in summer.
WHEREAS, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 require that universities make courses accessible to all students; and

WHEREAS, California State University Executive Orders 926 (2005) and 1111 (2018) call for all courses to be accessible to all students; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion encompasses providing equitable access to education to all students regardless of disability status; and

WHEREAS, Accessible course materials are an important component of education and student success at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, Continual measurement and remediation are necessary for the university to sustain continuous improvement in accessibility; and

WHEREAS, The Canvas LMS is itself accessible, and it will include a tool, Ally, for evaluating the accessibility of posted course materials and suggesting possible steps for remediation; and

WHEREAS, The accessibility of web pages within Cal Poly Drupal can also be determined by the site administrators, facilitating remediation

WHEREAS, Some faculty may need help moving course materials to the LMS; therefore be it

RESOLVED: Faculty are strongly encouraged to post course materials within the LMS, and be it further
RESOLVED: Faculty are strongly encouraged to post any course materials not posted within the LMS on a Cal Poly Drupal site, and be it further

RESOLVED: The university will provide training and support for faculty moving teaching materials into the LMS.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Date: April 28, 2020
Summary
The purpose of this resolution is to ensure that the university can collect data on the overall accessibility of course materials at Cal Poly. Achieving a universally high level of accessibility is a worthy long-term goal, but one that cannot be achieved with a single resolution. This resolution is only a small step towards that goal. However, it will accomplish two things, one of which requires immediate action. First, it will facilitate measurement of our progress. Second, by demonstrating our commitment to accessibility, it may shield the university from legal action as detailed below.

Background
Many of our students have disabilities; course materials can be designed in such a way that they don’t put unnecessary barriers between those students and their learning. Two examples may be helpful.
- A properly designed table can be parsed by a screenreader for student who is blind.
- Captions can make videos accessible for a student who is deaf.
Providing equitable access to learning is consistent with Cal Poly’s shared values. It is also required by law and by the policy of the California State University system.

Law
The most relevant laws are Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Universities that aren’t complying with these laws have been targeted for lawsuits by student plaintiffs. A sampling of these cases can be found [here](#).

CSU Policy
The CSU Chancellor issued Executive Orders 926 (2005) and 1111 (2018), which established CSU policy for compliance with disability law. The Accessible Technology Initiative has more detailed information about implementation at the CSU system level. The Cal Poly ATI website has information specific to our campus.

Canvas Ally Tool
The Ally tool within the Canvas LMS will allow instructors to gauge the accessibility of the items that they have posted on their courses. It will also allow the university to see the overall level of accessibility of course materials posted at Cal Poly. Collecting this data will allow the university to gauge the effectiveness of its efforts to improve the overall accessibility of posted course materials at Cal Poly. However, this data will be meaningful only if most faculty post their course materials on the LMS.

Faculty Workload
Converting all of one’s teaching materials from inaccessible to accessible could be for many faculty members an arduous task, a task that should not fall to individual faculty members as an unfunded mandate. This resolution does ask that of them. Instead, it is a request to post materials on the LMS, with aid supplied by the university, so that the Cal Poly can measure progress towards accessibility of the university as whole.
ACADEMIC SENATE  
of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA  
AS-___-20  
RESOLUTION ON THE MARKETING OF CAL POLY’S  
EDUCATIONAL IDENTITY AND GOALS  
WHEREAS, The voice of the faculty is integral to framing Cal Poly’s educational identity and goals; and  
WHEREAS, The WASC Commission Action Letter from 2010 asked that Cal Poly “identify more clearly the aspirational goals of the institution, and the role of faculty in helping to shape possible changes in the institution’s identity”; and  
WHEREAS, The Report of the WASC Visiting Team: Capacity and Preparatory Review from the last full accreditation review by WASC in 2010 cited the “need for a measurable definition of the signature pedagogy of Cal Poly, that of Learn-by-Doing”; and  
WHEREAS, The Report of the WASC Visiting Team in 2012, “recommended that additional attention be given to clearly: a) defining what is meant by the term “comprehensive polytechnic university””; and  
WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s faculty have spoken through Academic Senate resolutions on the definition of Learn by Doing (AS-727-11) and the adoption and definition of Cal Poly’s identity as a comprehensive polytechnic (AS-650-06); and  
WHEREAS, In our WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Report (December 2009), Cal Poly recognized the combination of our Learn by Doing pedagogy, our adoption of the teacher-scholar model, our intention to provide “a meaningful reply to the fractured nature of higher education,” and our commitment to the “development of vigorous programs in the arts, science, and humanities” in reaffirming our identity as a “comprehensive polytechnic university”; and  
WHEREAS, One foundation of President Armstrong’s Vision 2022 affirms Cal Poly as a “comprehensive polytechnic university”; and  
WHEREAS, Recently developed Cal Poly marketing/branding policies and documents, though since corrected after feedback from the Academic Senate, originally contained a description of Cal Poly as a “holistic polytechnic” and a definition of Learn by Doing that differed from and ignored previously adopted definitions of these concepts; therefore, be it  
RESOLVED: That Cal Poly’s marketing/branding policies and materials include references to and definitions of Cal Poly’s educational identity and goals based only on those documents which have received both faculty endorsement via the Academic Senate and approval by the President; and be it further
RESOLVED: That Cal Poly’s Academic Senate be consulted through all stages of future efforts to modify marketing/branding policies and materials intended to promote Cal Poly’s educational identity.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: April 28, 2020