Meeting of the Academic Senate  
Tuesday, November 19, 2019  
UU 220, 3:10 to 5:00 pm

I. **Minutes**: October 29, 2019 minutes (p. 2)

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

III. **Reports**:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: None
   B. President’s Office: (pp. 3-4)
   C. Provost: None
   D. Vice President for Student Affairs: (p. 5)
   E. Statewide Senate: (to be distributed at meeting)
   F. CFA: (p. 6)
   G. ASI: (pp. 7-8)

IV. **Special Reports**:
   A. **Student Evaluation Response Rates for AY 2018-2019**: Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair (pp. 9-17)
   B. **[TIME CERTAIN 3:20 p.m.] International Center Update**: Cari Vanderkar and Charles Chadwell, International Programs
   C. **[TIME CERTAIN 4:00 p.m.] OUDI Inclusive Excellence Update**: Julie Garcia, Interim Associate VP for OUDI
   D. **Library Collections Update**: Adriana Popescu, Dean of Library Services (pp. 18-22)

V. **Consent Agenda**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name or Course Number, Title</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/ Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME 403 Access by Design</td>
<td>Reviewed and recommended for approval 10/32/19</td>
<td>On the 11/19/19 consent agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Rehabilitation Engineering (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Disciplinary Studies Minor in Biotechnology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Course Proposal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA 441 Bioinformatics Capstone I (2), 2 laboratories – reviewed 9/19/19 and recommended for approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA 442 Bioinformatics Capstone II (2), 2 laboratories – reviewed 9/26/19 and recommended for approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. **Business Items**:
   A. **Resolution in Support of the Academic Senate of the California State University Resolution AS-3397-19 Towards Implementation of an Ethnic Studies System Requirement**: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, first reading (pp. 23-30)
   B. **Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Subchapter 11.5: Associate Dean Appointments**: Ken Brown, Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading (pp. 31-35)
   C. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Subchapter 12.2: Office Hours**: Ken Brown, Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading (pp. 36-43)

VII. **Discussion Item(s)**:

VIII. **Adjournment**

805-756-1258  --  academicsenate.calpoly.edu
Meeting of the Academic Senate  
Tuesday, October 29, 2019  
UU 220, 3:10 to 5:00 pm

I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve the minutes from the October 8, 2019 Academic Senate meeting.

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

III. Reports: Jessica Darin, Associate Vice President and Chief of Staff from the Office of the President, requested the following updated information to be included in the minutes: In case of a major power outage, there will be a physical community resource center established in the Performing Arts Center for students, faculty and staff. Similarly, the county and PG&E will establish additional resource centers for the public. All other reports were submitted in writing at the request of the Senate Chair. The reports can be found at: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/sa102919.pdf

IV. Special Reports:
A. Canvas Update: Tonia Malone, CTLT, gave a report on the transition from PolyLearn to Canvas which will be taking place in Fall of 2020. This report can be found at: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/presentations/2019-2020/Canvas.pdf
C. Immediate Access Presentation: Amie Mellinger, Director, Cal Poly University Store presented a report on Immediate Access for course texts. This report can be found at: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/presentations/2019-2020/Immediate%20Access.pdf

V. Consent Agenda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED BY ACADEMIC SENATE</th>
<th>ASCC Academic</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAT 466 Senior Project: Statistical Consulting (4), 2 lectures, 2 discussions</td>
<td>Reviewed 9/26/19, additional information requested from department. Recommended for approval 10/18/19</td>
<td>On the 10/29/19 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Updating the United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP) Criteria: Jose Navarro, GE Governance Board and Diversity and Inclusion Working Group, presented a resolution that would revise the university’s USCP criteria, which has not been updated for nearly ten years. This resolution will return in first status reading at the next Academic Senate meeting.

VII. Discussion Item(s): none

VIII. Adjournment: 5:00 pm

Submitted by,  
Francesca Tiesi  
Academic Senate Student Assistant

805-756-1258 -- academicsenate.calpoly.edu
Appointments to the Stakeholder Advisory Committee to Consider the Selection of the Chancellor Announced

(November 7, 2019) – A Stakeholder Advisory Committee has been appointed to assist in the confidential national search for the next California State University Chancellor, CSU Board of Trustees Chairman Adam Day announced today.

Members of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee include:

- Catherine Nelson, Ph.D., chair, CSU Academic Senate and professor, Sonoma State University (faculty representative)
- Robert Keith Collins, Ph.D., vice chair, CSU Academic Senate and professor, San Francisco State University (faculty representative)
- Michael D. Hendren, facilities management, California State University, Sacramento (staff representative)
- Michael Wiafe, president, Cal State Student Association and student, San Diego State University (student representative)
- Jeremy Addis-Mills, president-elect, CSU Alumni Council and alumnus, California State University San Marcos (alumni representative)
- Jeffrey D. Armstrong, Ph.D., president, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
- Soraya M. Coley, Ph.D., president, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

The Advisory Committee will serve in concert with the Special Committee to Consider the Selection of the Chancellor in the search to identify a successor to Timothy P. White who announced his intent to retire at the end of the 2019-20 academic year.

Both committees will participate in a series of open forums as part of a listening tour beginning on Tuesday, November 12, from 12 p.m. to 2 p.m. in the University Union Ballroom at Sacramento State.

The forum at Sac State will be the first of six planned forums to gather feedback from stakeholders and interested parties as the committees search for the university’s next chancellor. Feedback gathered at the forums will help guide the recruitment activities over the next several months, with the goal to appoint a new chancellor in summer 2020.
The open forums will also be livestreamed on the Chancellor's recruitment website. The website will provide information about the search, including a place for people to submit feedback regarding the next chancellor directly to the committees.

Chairman Day previously announced the trustees appointed to a Special Committee to Consider the Selection of the Chancellor to conduct the search. Jean Picker Firstenberg will chair the Special Committee. Other trustees participating include Debra Farar (committee vice chair), Silas Abrego, Wenda Fong, Juan Garcia, Romey Saballos and Peter Taylor. Chairman Day, Board Vice Chair Lillian Kimbell and Chancellor White will serve as ex-officio members of the committee. Additionally, Trustee Emerita Roberta Achtenberg will serve as senior advisor to the committee.

About the California State University
The California State University is the largest system of four-year higher education in the country, with 23 campuses, 52,000 faculty and staff and 481,000 students. Half of the CSU's students transfer from California community colleges. Created in 1960, the mission of the CSU is to provide high-quality, affordable education to meet the ever-changing needs of California. With its commitment to quality, opportunity, and student success, the CSU is renowned for superb teaching, innovative research and for producing job-ready graduates. Each year, the CSU awards more than 125,000 degrees. One in every 20 Americans holding a college degree is a graduate of the CSU and our alumni are 3.7 million strong. Connect with and learn more about the CSU in the CSU NewsCenter.
The first campus dialogue about the CPX results will be held on Thursday, November 21 from 9am-10:30am in the ATL (7). Please join OUDI to talk about the results, what opportunities you see, and be a part of the conversation of improving our campus climate.

Residence Halls and Apartments on campus are open next week, and we anticipate about 150 students remaining on campus over the break. University Housing will host a Thanksgiving dinner for all who remain on campus.

As we approach the holiday season, students can feel financially stressed for many reasons. Campus Health and Wellbeing offers Cash Course available online at www.cashcourse.org to grow their financial education.
BARGAINING SURVEY. Systemwide, 5318 CFA members have taken the bargaining survey. Of those, 2969 identified their primary campus. Of those, 143 identified Cal Poly SLO as their primary campus. The bargaining survey will remain open through November 25. CFA encourages all members who have not yet taken the survey to do so. CFA encourages non-members to join the union, then take the survey. The bargaining survey is available at https://www.calfac.org/bargaining-survey-2019

TENURE TRACK HIRES. The 2019-2020 California state budget act allocates $35 million to increase the number of tenure-track faculty in the CSU. This money must be used to fund new tenure-track positions (not replacements for retirements or separations). Cal Poly's share of the allocation is 14 new full-time tenure-track faculty positions. The Provost's Office has authorized searches for these 14 new positions, plus an additional 3 new positions, for a total of 17 new tenure-track positions.
ASI Report
November 19, 2019

- **Resolution #19-03** - The ASI Board of Directors passed Resolution #19-03: Resolution in Support of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. The resolution calls for more robust support for our DACA students in response to the Supreme Court deciding the legitimacy of the current administration’s repeal of DACA. In this resolution, the Board of Directors made a specific ask of the Cal Poly Academic Senate. It reads: "Therefore be it resolved: The Cal Poly Academic Senate works closely with the Cal Poly Dream Center to review and modify university policies which negatively impact undocumented students."

- **Student Success Fee Allocation Advisory Committee** - The SSFAAC met last Thursday to hear proposals from different divisions across the university of where base, or reoccurring funds, could be put towards. The members of that committee have approximately one week to seek consultation from their respective divisions of where the money should be allocated. On Thursday, the committee will vote for a proposed suggestion of where the funds should go to President Armstrong for final approval.

- **Cal Poly Opportunity Fee Committee** - The CPOF Committee met last Tuesday to discuss the proposed allocations of student support funds from base allocations. These were scheduled to be voted on right before this meeting.

- **Meeting with CSU Board of Trustee member Larry Adamson** - A group of students, including myself, met with CSU Board of Trustee representative Larry Adamson. The group discussed various policy changes, such as the proposal for an additional a-g requirement of "quantitative reasoning" with Trustee Adamson.

- **CPX Listening Schedule** - Student Government is encouraging its members to to attend an event next Thursday, November 21st titled: "CPX Campus Dialogue." At the event, all members of the university community are invited to collectively process the results of the CPX survey and listening sessions and generate ideas that will help our campuswide action planning process later this year. **The event will be held from 9 AM – 10:30 AM in the ATL.**

- **Buck the Stigma** - This week is Buck the Stigma, Student Government's Mental Health Awareness Week. In collaboration with campus partners across the university and community, Student Government has planned events all week that can be seen on the flyer attached. Student Government would like to encourage all faculty to seek out ways to connect their students to mental health resources on campus and reduce stigma around seeking mental health resources by avoiding ableist language and believing students in mental and emotional distress.
BUCK THE STIGMA
fall 2019 mental health awareness week

Let's start the conversation today.

MONDAY
NOVEMBER 18
DON'T HATE, ADVOCATE
Happy To Be Me
University Union Plaza, 10:30 am-12:30 pm
Movie Night & Discussion: Silver Linings Playbook
yakultu Welcome Center, 6:00-9:00 pm

TUESDAY
NOVEMBER 19
SELF WORTH, SELF FIRST
Tension Release
Dexter Lawn, 10:30 am-12:30 pm
Mindful Yoga
6:00-7:30 pm, check PULSE booths for location

WEDNESDAY
NOVEMBER 20
THINK IT, LIVE IT
Spark Joy
University Union Plaza, 10:30 am-12:30 pm
Emotional Support Dogs
Dexter Lawn, 1:00-3:00 pm
Mental Health Dialogue Meeting & Pizza
PULSE Conference Room (27-11), 7:00-9:00 pm

THURSDAY
NOVEMBER 21
STRONGER TOGETHER
Give & Receive Acts of Kindness
Dexter Lawn, 11:00 am-12:00 pm
PULSE Resource Fair
Dexter Lawn, 3:00-5:00 pm
QPR Training
6:30-8:30 pm, check PULSE booths for location

FRIDAY
NOVEMBER 22
TIME TO REFLECT
Craft & Relax: Create to Escape
Cal Poly Recreation Center Training Room, 10:30-12:30 pm
Online Student Evaluation of Instruction
Response Rates
2018 – 2019

Prepared by
Office of Academic Personnel

And Presented by
Ken Brown
Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee chair
Fall 2019
Pilot commenced Spring 2015–Spring 2016

Procedure

- Evaluation period during last two weeks of instruction
- Students notified by email
  - One email per class per day

Response rates in pilot

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2016</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedure for university-wide rollout 2016-2017

Two one-week evaluation periods
  • Normal: Sunday–Friday of last week of instruction
  • Early: Sunday–Friday of penultimate week of instruction

Students notified by email
  • Prior to evaluation period
  • Daily reminders for evaluations not yet completed

Response rates:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2017</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedure for 2017-2018

**Students**
- Portal shows links for class evaluations
- Email reminders at start of evaluation and Wed, Thur, Fri

**Instructors**
- Email about response rates
- Portal links for their evaluated classes
- Portal reports response rates

**Response Rates 2017-2018**

- Fall 2017  59%
- Winter 2018  58%
- Spring 2018  54%
Response Rate Accumulation for Fall 2017, Winter 2018 and Spring 2018

- **Fall 2017**
  - Sunday: 7.55%
  - Monday: 9.08%
  - Tuesday: 18.20%
  - Wednesday: 26.79%
  - Thursday: 36.07%
  - Friday: 53.76%

- **Winter 2018**
  - Sunday: 18.75%
  - Monday: 20.68%
  - Tuesday: 29.83%
  - Wednesday: 39.90%
  - Thursday: 50.35%
  - Friday: 57.63%

- **Spring 2018**
  - Sunday: 28.41%
  - Monday: 28.41%
  - Tuesday: 39.09%
  - Wednesday: 50.13%
  - Thursday: 50.13%
  - Friday: 59.22%
Procedure for 2018-2019

Students
- Portal shows links for class evaluations
- Email reminders at start of evaluation and Wed, Thur, Fri

Faculty
- **No more response rate notification emails**
- Faculty have the ability to monitor response rates live through the portlet
- Faculty access to portlet on the Monday before the evaluation period
- Faculty receive email notification that courses queued for evaluation are visible on the portlet
- Faculty encouraged to ensure all courses that meet the evaluation criteria are queued.
Response Rate Accumulation for Fall 2018, Winter 2019 and Spring 2019
Response Rates 2018-2019

Fall 2018  55%
Winter 2019  57%
Spring 2019  51%

Same Procedure for 2019-2020
Response Rate by College
Fall 2018, Winter 2019 and Spring 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
<th>Winter 2019</th>
<th>Spring 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>52.65%</td>
<td>50.19%</td>
<td>52.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>50.65%</td>
<td>45.88%</td>
<td>46.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>54.68%</td>
<td>50.65%</td>
<td>57.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>51.36%</td>
<td>53.21%</td>
<td>50.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>57.65%</td>
<td>62.56%</td>
<td>63.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>47.75%</td>
<td>42.22%</td>
<td>43.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>47.07%</td>
<td>47.07%</td>
<td>51.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>54.86%</td>
<td>54.86%</td>
<td>56.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.91%</td>
<td>50.91%</td>
<td>50.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Update to Academic Senate
11/13/19

Sources of Funding for Information Resources (library collections)

1. CSU Chancellor’s Office – The Electronic Core Collection (ECC)

The ECC began in 1999 as an initiative of the CSU Council of Library Deans (COLD). It is funded by the CSU Chancellor’s Office, Academic Technology Services Division. Decisions about subscribed content included in the ECC are made by COLD, based on recommendations made by a COLD standing committee, EAR (Electronic Access to Information Resources), whose ten members include two deans, plus librarian representatives from small, medium, and large CSU campuses, each serving two-year terms.

The ECC has a range of disciplinary content, including business, humanities, social sciences, law, technology, music, and physical and life sciences. The ECC is weak in STEM content, however, with several core resources missing. For example, the ECC does not include the most recent six years of the journals *Science* or *Nature*. Neither does it include the top science journal database, Elsevier’s ScienceDirect or the key resource for chemistry majors and faculty, American Chemical Society Journals.

Until 2019, the ECC budget was $5 million per year, a flat allocation since 2008. Thanks to the advocacy of many partners over the 2018-2019 academic year, the plea for additional funding for the Electronic Core Collection was heard and the Executive Vice Chancellor, Dr. Loren Blanchard, allocated an additional $1 million in base funds to this critical resource that benefits all California State University students, staff, and faculty. This case could not have been made without the support of the Statewide Academic Senate and the senates of many CSU campuses, including Cal Poly Academic Senate and ASI. The current funding for ECC is $6 million per year.

The ECC currently includes a collection of subscription databases of published content, including scholarly articles, popular news and magazine articles, reference articles, business data, and e-books. Here is the full list of 2018-19 ECC databases:
http://libraries.calstate.edu/ecc-faq/#db
2. Cal Poly budget allocation

- Estimated base need is based on 5% year over year compounding cost increase due to inflation (ongoing subscriptions)
- 1x/RF funding covers inflation cost increases and sustains book purchases, historical backfiles of journal content (one-time payments)
- 1x/RF funding is not a sustainable solution to support subscriptions for existing or new resources (databases, journals)
California State University Libraries
Update on Elsevier Contract Negotiations

The situation: It is time for the California State University Libraries to renew their contract with Elsevier, one of the world’s largest scientific, technical, and medical information publishers. Elsevier provides libraries with bundles of online journal subscriptions via its ScienceDirect platform.

CSU’s Elsevier subscription (a bundled package known in the industry as a Big Deal) is purchased through the Chancellor’s Office (CO). The subscription package includes 1,441 current journal titles of the 3,412 that Elsevier markets. Additionally, to support local needs, some libraries supplement this Big Deal with additional subscriptions to Elsevier journals not included in the CO Bundle.

1. Do CSU faculty and researchers use all the titles in the CSU subscription?
No. Most CSU campuses have downloaded zero articles from many Elsevier journals. The majority of CSU campus users download articles that we purchased in prior years. Fewer than 25% of downloads are from current materials. A good analogy is cable television where subscribers pay for channels they never watch.

2. Why is this a problem?
Like other publishing platforms, Elsevier has built a business model underwritten by publicly-funded research, faculty scholarship, faculty peer review, and faculty editorial board management. Elsevier then charges libraries annual or multiyear subscription fees to buy access to journals that exist only because of the public research funding and faculty work effort. This business model has rewarded Elsevier with a profit margin reported at 36% -- higher than Apple, Google, or Amazon reported for the same year.

This profit margin has been sustained by the steady increase in subscription rates charged to academic libraries. According to the American Library Association, “Rapidly rising journal subscription prices have severely eroded the ability of libraries, universities, and scholars to purchase the publications necessary for research and education. While the Consumer Price Index (CPI) increased 73% between 1986-2004, research library expenditures for serials increased 273%. Since then, annual price index reports by the trade magazine Library Journal document the continued inexorable increase in serials costs, almost always in excess of the CPI.”
The relentless rise in subscription costs for Elsevier and other online journal bundles has serious ramifications. The escalating costs mean that over time, CSU libraries have purchased fewer titles, greatly hampering the ability of the libraries to support emerging fields and inhibiting a diverse representation of ideas and research. Less access to research is bad for science. For more insight into the current landscape of academic publishing, see the free documentary, Paywall: The Business of Scholarship.

3. **How much does Elsevier charge CSU libraries for their subscriptions?**
   In 2019, Elsevier charged the CSU system $3,949,602 for its subscription to current journals in ScienceDirect, a 4.5% increase over the previous year. Elsevier subscription costs are shared among the CSU libraries and comprise a significant portion of the annual acquisitions budget for every library in the system.

4. **Do CSU faculty publish with Elsevier?**
   Yes. According to ScienceDirect, CSU authors published 8,680 articles in Elsevier journals from 2010 to 2019.

5. **Are CSU authors charged a fee for publishing Open Access articles in Elsevier journals?**
   Some faculty want the articles they write to be available for free, that is via open access, instead of behind a subscription paywall. To make an article available via open access, Elsevier imposes an Article Publishing Charge (APC) of approximately $3,000 (depending on the journal) on authors. Under the APC model, Elsevier profits, in effect, twice from publicly-supported educational institutions by (1) charging for subscriptions which limit access to these journals to subscribers and (2) imposing APCs that authors or other funders pay if they seek to make their research publicly available.

   In 2018, CSU authors published approximately 1,100 articles in Elsevier journals. Only a small number of these articles were published as open access. Collectively, it would have cost the CSU system approximately $3.3 million to make all of the Elsevier articles published by CSU authors freely available to all readers—even though, in many cases, the articles were funded by public research grants and written and edited by faculty at publicly-supported universities. These APC costs would have been on top of annual subscription fees paid by the CSU for access to ScienceDirect.

6. **What can we do about this?**
   We can use the collective power of the CSU system to negotiate a better deal for our faculty and students. The University of California libraries were able to take a strong negotiating position with Elsevier because the UC Faculty supported their libraries. If the CSU Faculty likewise support the possibility that the CSU Libraries could walk away from the Elsevier contract, we are then in a strong negotiating position with Elsevier. We can push Elsevier hard for a transformative agreement that reduces subscription costs, limits annual price increases, and moves toward a model that allows CSU authors to make their work more widely available in open access.
7. What can YOU do about this?
Are you willing to support the CSU Libraries? This may mean the CSU Libraries will refuse to pay subscription costs for overpriced journals and databases until we can come to a more conducive agreement. The UCs ended their negotiations with Elsevier. In the aftermath, the UC libraries successfully negotiated a transformative, open-access, agreement with Cambridge University Press in which the universities will see no significant overall increase to the cost of its contract. In the Cambridge agreement, UC faculty retain their copyright, and UC faculty will have the option of publishing their articles open access with APCs subsidized either by faculty from their grant funding or by the UC libraries.

The impact of the CSU walking away from renewing with Elsevier would be largely limited to losing access to future publishing. Because the CSUs paid for “perpetual rights” in previous contracts, we retain perpetual access to most of the Elsevier articles to which we had access under those contracts. CSU faculty, students, and staff still have access and can download those articles.

We have the potential to change the power dynamics, to give faculty rights to what they have authored, and to ensure that taxpayers and citizens all over the world have access to scholarly research. All we ask is that our faculty support us as we begin an honest and difficult conversation with a company that cares more about its bottom line than it does about making knowledge open and available to all.

10-14-19

Questions: email Adriana Popescu, Dean of Library Services (popescu@calpoly.edu)
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE

of

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-_____

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY’S RESOLUTION TOWARDS IMPLEMENTATION OF AN ETHNIC STUDIES SYSTEM REQUIREMENT

WHEREAS, the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU), as part of its advocacy against AB 1460 (Weber), passed without dissent the resolution Towards Implementation of an Ethnic Studies System Requirement (AS-3397-19); and

WHEREAS, the ASCSU affirms its commitment to “explore with the campuses an ethnic studies requirement that each CSU baccalaureate graduate shall meet, with parameters determined by the ASCSU after seeking guidance from the CSU Council on Ethnic Studies and the 23 CSU campus senates” (AS-3397-19);

WHEREAS, the Cal Poly Academic Senate Executive Committee submitted guidance in October 2019 to the ACSCU; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Academic Senate support the ASCSU’s collaboration with the CSU Council on Ethnic Studies and the 23 campuses “to develop appropriate, assessable learning outcomes as system-wide minima,” especially its efforts to “provid[e] campus autonomy and differentiation via additional campus-specific elements” (AS-3397-19); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the implementation of any such possible requirement would lead to the redefinition of the Academic Senate USCP Review Committee, thereby keeping the curricular oversight in an Academic Senate committee that coordinates with the General Education Governance Board and Academic Senate Curriculum Committee.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee

Date: November 5, 2019
1. Current Requirements for United States Cultural Pluralism Requirement

Instituted in 1991 by the Cal Poly Academic Senate (AS-361-91), the United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP) requirement had to emphasize one of four “U.S. Cultures: Asian American, African American, Hispanic American, American Indian” (AS-395-92), but in 2009 the Academic Senate recognized that “diversity in America is much broader than is currently represented by the USCP requirement” (AS-676-09). In response, it broadened the scope of the course criteria to include “[c]ontemporary social issues resulting from cultural conflict or restricted opportunities, including, but not limited to, problems associated with discrimination based on age, ethnicity, gender, nationality, abilities, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, or race” (AS-676-09).

Currently, USCP courses must focus on all of the following areas:

- CR1: One or more diverse groups, as defined in the Cal Poly Statement of Diversity, whose contributions to contemporary American society have been impeded by cultural conflict or restricted opportunities;
- CR2: Contemporary social issues resulting from conflict or restricted opportunities, including, but not limited to, problems associated with discrimination based on age, ethnicity, gender, nationality, abilities, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, or race;
- CR3: Critical thinking skills used by students to approach these contemporary social issues, examine their own attitudes, and consider the diverse perspectives of others;
- CR4: The contributions of people from diverse groups to contemporary American society.

In addition to satisfying these criteria, USCP courses must also address the University’s Diversity Learning Objectives, which were updated on June 4, 2019 and available online at https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/academicpolicies/diversity_lo.

Oversight of the USCP requirement is the responsibility of the United States Cultural Pluralism Review Committee, a standing committee of the Academic Senate, as well as the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee.

2. Current Course Offerings and Demand for USCP Courses

The majority of USCP courses at Cal Poly are located in the College of Liberal Arts, with 80 courses offered across 14 departments. The College of Science and Math offers 4 courses in one department; the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences
offers 2 courses across 2 departments; the College of Architecture and Environmental Design offers 1 course; and the College of Business offers 1 course.

The USCP requirement, which functions mainly as an overlay to the General Education Program, with 64/88 courses with USCP designation as GE courses, is currently not an obstacle to graduation; Cal Poly students graduate on average with a total of 1.8 USCP courses by the time they graduate. Indeed, from 2013-2018, enrollment capacity for USCP courses have exceeded total enrollment (see Table 1).

3. Continuous Improvement of the USCP Requirement at Cal Poly

As part of Cal Poly’s revision to General Education, which commenced in response to Executive Order 1100(r), the Academic Senate at Cal Poly created a workgroup on Diversity and Inclusivity, which recommended a series of four separate senate resolutions:

A. An update to the Diversity Learning Objectives to reflect the suggested changes made by the GE Diversity & Inclusion committee;
B. An update to the USCP Criteria for clarity and to map better to the newly proposed DLOs;
C. An adoption of adopting learning objectives (LOs) for existing lower and upper division USCP courses;
D. Require both lower- and upper-division USCP courses for all students except transfer students. Transfer students will still be required to meet the upper division USCP requirement for graduation.

In Spring, 2019, the Academic Senate adopted revised Diversity Learning Objectives (AS-882-19), and it is currently considering the adoption of updated USCP criteria. The following recommendations will be taken up by the Academic Senate Executive Committee during the 2019-2020 Academic Year.

4. Response to the Academic Senate of the California State University’s Request for Feedback Regarding Implementation of an Ethnic Studies System Requirement

Given the timeframe for providing a response to the ASCSU’s request for feedback, the entire Cal Poly Academic Senate has not been able to take a formal position. However, the Academic Senate Executive Committee has been able to collect feedback from campus stakeholders and endorses the following response.

Cal Poly recognizes, as it outlines in its Strategic Plan that was endorsed by the Academic Senate (AS-863-19), the need to “create a rich culture of diversity and inclusivity that supports and celebrates the similarities and differences of every individual on campus” (https://president.calpoly.edu/vision-2022-future-cal-poly). In support of this mission, since 1992 the Academic Senate has developed USCP course criteria to ensure that students are deepening their understanding of diversity, equity and inclusivity. The upcoming resolutions on revising USCP further demonstrate the importance of these issues for the campus community.
Allowing the USCP requirement to function both separately as major or minor courses as well as a GE overlay provides flexibility for our students, as evidenced by the fact that students graduate with an average of 1.8 USCP courses. To limit this University-wide requirement to a narrower set of courses or departments could have a negative impact on graduate rates, especially if no additional funding is provided to add faculty positions in the areas specified in the CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies Report. The implementation of any such possible requirement would lead to the redefinition of the Academic Senate USCP Review Committee, thereby keeping the curricular oversight in an Academic Senate committee that coordinates with the General Education Governance Board and Academic Senate Curriculum Committee. Finally, flexibility of adding campus-specific requirements to any system-wide requirement would allow the University the ability to address more localized histories of inequity.

Table 1
TOTAL USCP ENROLLMENT (AY 2013-2014 TO AY 2017-2018)
Data provided by Cal Poly Academic Programs & Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year (AY)</th>
<th>Total USCP Sections</th>
<th>Enrl Capacity</th>
<th>Total Enrolled</th>
<th>Surplus Cap.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>225.0</td>
<td>9814.0</td>
<td>8881.0</td>
<td>933.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>220.0</td>
<td>9371.0</td>
<td>8222.0</td>
<td>1149.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>248.0</td>
<td>10517.0</td>
<td>9771.0</td>
<td>746.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>253.0</td>
<td>11019.0</td>
<td>10107.0</td>
<td>912.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>290.0</td>
<td>13255.0</td>
<td>11774.0</td>
<td>1481.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>247.2</td>
<td>10795.2</td>
<td>9751.0</td>
<td>1044.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Towards Implementation of an Ethnic Studies System Requirement

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) explore with the campuses an ethnic studies requirement that each CSU baccalaureate graduate shall meet, with parameters determined by the ASCSU after seeking guidance from the CSU Council on Ethnic Studies and the 23 CSU campus senates. Such guidance, to be received by November 1, 2019, shall include reflections on:

a. Considering the CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies Report and campus context, “What learning outcomes specific to ethnic studies as derived from current best practices and definitions of ethnic studies are to be included?”

b. Consideration of the tradeoff in having the ethnic studies requirement as a stand-alone graduation requirement versus as a required GE overlay (e.g., separately, within the major, or upper- or lower-division GE or parts of both?).

c. Should implementation allow for campus-specific additions to the requirement (consistent with the spirit of requirement)?

d. What best practices should be encouraged for campuses to adopt in their course evaluation and approval processes for meeting the learning outcomes specific to ethnic studies in order to maximize consistency and integrity of the requirement?

e. What would be the earliest feasible and appropriate date for implementation?

Resolved: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to CSU Chancellor, Timothy P. White, Executive Vice Chancellor, Loren Blanchard, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, California State Student Association (CSSA), Assembly Member Shirley Weber, Senator Richard Pan, CSU Ethnic Studies Council, and CSU-ERFSA.
RATIONALE: In the course of its advocacy against AB 1460 (Weber), the ASCSU committed to taking up the recommendation for a CSU ethnic studies graduation requirement in the Ethnic Studies Task Force Report. This resolution begins that process. The resolution requests timely feedback from campus senates and the CSU Council on Ethnic Studies in order to assist the ASCSU in determining how best to implement an ethnic studies 1 required component for baccalaureate level graduates of the CSU. The following list of prior suggestions and actions related to implementation of the proposed ethnic studies requirement is included as a resource for campuses to consider in the development of their responses to the questions in Resolved 2:

CSU Ethnic Studies Task Force Report:

AS-2954-10/FA “Resolution Condemning Hate Crimes within the CSU”
https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2009-2010/2954.pdf

AS-2818-08/FA “Support of International Experiences and Global Perspectives in CSU Education”

AS-3030-11/APEP “The Importance of Civic Education (CSU Graduation Requirements in United States History, Constitution, and American Institutions) for both Native and Transfer Students”
https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2010-2011/3030.pdf [concerns related to SB 1440 transfer]

AS-3164-14/AA/FA “In Support of Ethnic Studies in the California State University”
https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2013-2014/3164.pdf

---

1 This resolution deliberately uses lower case “e” and lower case “s” for ethnic studies to differentiate the requirement from the department.

2 This resolution deliberately uses “outcomes” in lieu of “courses” or “units” since outcomes describe that which is to be achieved and provides the greatest flexibility in how the desired outcomes are to be achieved.
In particular, we encourage campuses and the CSU Council on Ethnic Studies to collaborate with the ASCSU to develop appropriate, assessable learning outcomes as system-wide minima (providing campus autonomy and differentiation via additional campus-specific elements); to provide guidance on implementation (separate or overlay; within GE or external to GE; if GE, upper or lower division or both, etc.). The ASCSU also seeks best practice suggestions that could be implemented by campuses to protect the integrity of the requirement at the specification level, in the approval process, and in continuing assessments across time. These practices are a means to maintain campuses disciplinary coherence and the integrity of the requirement across time.

---

3 The potential draw of student enrollment for those departments seeking to expand their hiring or the desire to ‘protect’ or ‘help’ programs and/or departments to build FTES, can lead to the dilution or bending of standards to
An issue that campuses in particular may want to address is the potential impact on existing CSU programs. Most CSU programs are constrained by the 120 unit program limit and also by prior legislation (SB 1440 / Star act) that excludes campus specific requirements for SB 1440 transfer students (i.e., SB 1440 would effectively exclude all campus-specific ethnic studies graduation requirements without the presence of a system requirement to trigger the applicability for that set of incoming transfer students). The default ASCSU assumption is that SB 1440 students ought to be required to meet the ethnic studies requirement. To do so under current practices and constraints, the ethnic studies requirement needs to be a system requirement (even if further modified by the campuses), within GE, or a separate requirement in each academic program. One option is inclusion (likely as an overlay) into lower division GE for at least part of the requirement – this would assure all lower division students would have some exposure; It may also be possible to finesse the implications of a new system-wide requirement via a modification to transfer admission standards, other requirements of GE, or (legislatively) to the language prohibiting non-GE non-system requirements for AA/T and AS/T transfer students. There may be other non-yet conceptualized options.
RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
SUBCHAPTER 11.5: ASSOCIATE DEAN APPOINTMENTS

Impact on Existing Policy: This resolution recommends to the President that Cal Poly enact the attached policy as a new university-level policy directing colleges to formulate more detailed policies on associate dean appointments. It augments, but remains distinct from AS-659-07 Resolution on Searches for Academic Campus Administrators.¹

WHEREAS, New university academic personnel policies are established by shared governance and included in “University Faculty Personnel Policies” (UFPP); and

WHEREAS, Dean and Provost searches include consultation with faculty according to principles of shared governance; and

WHEREAS, Associate deans perform academic functions on behalf of deans, such as serving as the highest level of faculty evaluation for lecturer faculty, and make other vital decisions of significant interest to faculty and staff; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly has no policies specifically on academic associate dean appointments; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The policy included in the report “Proposal for University Faculty Personnel Policies: SUBCHAPTER 11.5 Associate Dean Appointments” be included in UFPP, and be it further

RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library revise their personnel policy documents by Fall 2020 to include the nature of consultation with faculty and staff in their associate dean appointments and place those policies in chapter 11 (Governance) of their personnel policy documents.
Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date:  [Sometime in 2019]

______________________________

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.
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 revise or create new personnel policies and place them in UFPP on an as-needed basis.

FAC recommends Cal Poly adopt a policy requiring colleges to develop and implement a consultative process with faculty and staff for associate dean appointments. FAC has solicited feedback on this proposed policy from the colleges, library, and counseling services, and will take that feedback into account as this proposed policy advances through the Senate process.

What follows is a summary of the proposed policy, an account of its impact on existing policy, and implementation.

This policy would go into effect by means of shared governance with the Academic Senate recommending to the President that the attached policy be adopted. As it affects appointments by means of the Management Personnel Program (MPP), which is outside the scope of faculty policy, the Senate’s action is advisory to the President. The President may choose to implement the policy the Senate recommends, and if so, the attached policy would enter UFPP by that endorsement from the President.

### Summary of SUBCHAPTER 11.5 Associate Dean Appointments

This proposed policy requires colleges and the library to utilize some sort of consultative process with faculty and staff in the appointment of associate deans. It also requires colleges and the library to specify the nature of this consultative process in their respective personnel policy documents.

### Impact on Existing Policy

Associate dean appointments are governed by CSU policy and state law about the Management Personnel Program (MPP). This new policy would establish a further requirement of some sort of consultative process with faculty and staff, to be defined by the colleges, in the appointment of associate deans. This is a policy about policy in that it requires colleges and the library to formulate such policy for their own application. It makes no further specification about how such college and library policies shall be formulated, but leaves that to the colleges and library to sort out for themselves.

The Academic Senate previously approved a resolution on MPP search processes (AS-659-07 - Resolution on Searches for Academic Campus Administrators). The resolution primarily addressed recruitment for MPP positions involving search processes rather than appointment of associate deans.

Faculty Affairs Committee, Fall 2019
from within the current faculty. This resolution was advisory, and President Baker acknowledged it as such.

**Implementation**

This policy would go into effect upon ratification by the President with a very near-term timeline for the colleges to formulate their policies about all subsequent associate dean positions, at the longest by Fall of the next academic year.

What follows is the proposed new policy, as a subchapter of UFPP Chapter 11: Governance...
11.5. Associate Dean Appointments

11.5.1. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION]

11.5.2. Appointment of associate deans is governed by the MPP (Management Personnel Program) policies of the CSU and state law.

11.5.3. The appointment of associate deans in the colleges or library shall involve a consultative process with faculty and staff.

11.5.4. Colleges and the library shall specify in their personnel policy documents the nature of the consultation with faculty and staff for standard appointments of associate deans.
RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
SUBCHAPTER 12.2: OFFICE HOURS

Impact on Existing Policy: The policy enacted by this resolution supersedes CAM 370.2, established by AS-91-80. Further details about its impact on existing policy is described in the attached report. 

1 WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s office hour policy was last updated in 1980; and
2 WHEREAS, Office hours in the form of regularly scheduled, direct, and immediate interaction with students remains integral to Cal Poly’s instructional mission; and
3 WHEREAS, Improvements in online communication with students has reduced some of the need for office hours; and
4 WHEREAS, Online and hybrid forms of course delivery especially warrant the use of synchronous online modes of office hours; and
5 WHEREAS, Online directories of office hours and teaching schedules facilitate the communication of office hour availability to students and the rest of the university community; and
6 WHEREAS, Office hour policies should be flexible to accommodate for varying needs of instructors and differences in the ways faculty interact with students in various instructional settings across the university; and

RESOLVED: The office hour policy contained in the attached report “Proposed Subchapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document: SUBCHAPTER 12.2: Office Hours” be established as Subchapter 12.2: Office Hours of UFPP, and be it further
RESOLVED: Colleges revise chapter 12 of their personnel policy documents by Fall 2020 to include office hours suited to the needs of their faculty and the students they serve, and be it further.

RESOLVED: Cal Poly establish a readily accessible online directory allowing the university community to access faculty teaching and office hour schedules.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: [Sometime in 2020]

1 (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.
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 revise or create new personnel policies and place them in UFPP on an as-needed basis.

In Spring 2016 FAC recommended to the Academic Senate Executive Committee that a task force be formed to draft a new university office hour policy. In Spring 2018 the office hour task force concluded its work by proposing to the Academic Senate a resolution on office hour policies. The Academic Senate voted against that resolution. FAC agreed to take on the task of drafting a new office hour policy during AY 2018-19 for inclusion in UFPP. This proposed new office hour policy underwent extensive consultative review in Spring and Fall 2019, including meetings with the following groups:

- ASI Board of Directors
- Associate Deans Council
- Provost’s Leadership Council

College deans distributed draft policy text to their department chairs and heads and to interested faculty. FAC received a great deal of feedback from all these affected parties and significantly revised the policy into the form now proposed for Senate consideration.

The rest of this document addresses all the aspects of a personnel policy revision that the FAC requires of itself when it proposes such changes to the Senate:

- Summary of the proposed policy
- Account of impact on existing policy, including the existing policy text
- How the policy would be implemented
- The text of the new policy

### Summary of subchapter 12.2: Office Hours

The proposed office hour policy comprises a subchapter of UFPP Chapter 12: Workload.

The proposed office hour policy includes a statement of the contribution office hours make to the educational mission of Cal Poly. It defines what an office hour is, specifies minimum office hours for instructional faculty, and scales office hours to instructional assignments. It requires colleges to define their own more specific office hour policies and to publish them in their personnel policy documents. The policy allows for additional required scheduled office hours to be connected to various advising functions, provides guidance about how to coordinate the mode of office hours with the mode of instruction, and covers the notification of the scheduling of office hours and of changes or cancellation...
Simulated output of the text as if reading it naturally:

Proposed Subchapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document:
SUBCHAPTER 12.2: Office Hours

of office hours. The policy also provides provisions for granting ad hoc exceptions and for considering the role of exceptions in shaping further revisions to office hour policies.

Impact on Existing Policy

Subchapter 12.2 supersedes any and all other existing university, college, and department office hour policies that are inconsistent with the proposed university policy. Any subordinate policy consistent with the minimal provisions of the new office hour policy may remain in effect until that faculty unit decides to revise it.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement includes among the professional responsibilities of faculty “maintaining office hours, and/or opportunities for student consultation connected to online teaching” (CBA 20.1b). Further policy about office hours exists at the campus level.

The current university office hour policy at Cal Poly superseded a prior and rather simple office hour policy that “...each faculty member must schedule and conduct at least one office hour each day (Monday through Friday) for consultation with students...” Campus Administrative Manual (CAM) section 370.2. In 1980 the Academic Senate revised CAM 370.2 into the current office hour policy:

“In addition to scheduled classes, each full-time faculty member must schedule and conduct at least five (5) office hours each week (not more than two hours each day) for consultation with students. The faculty members will post their office hours outside their office doors. This section does not preclude pre-arranged appointments with students. Part-time faculty and full-time faculty with reduced teaching loads will have office hours proportional to their assignments.”

CAM is no longer the governing policy document at Cal Poly. Much of CAM has been revised into provisions of Campus Administrative Policies (CAP) or distributed to a variety of other repositories of policy around campus. The provisions on faculty workload are not in CAP but instead are on the Academic Personnel website, which summarizes the office hour policy on its Working Conditions webpage as follows:

“Full-time faculty members conduct at least five office hours each week for student consultation. Part-time and full-time faculty with reduced teaching loads schedule office hours in proportion to their assignments.”

This statement is located here:

https://academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/handbook/workingconditions

Some colleges and departments include the university office hour policy in their policy documents. For instance, The Architecture Department includes the following in its list of faculty responsibilities: “[m]aintain a minimum of 5 scheduled office hours per week in a designated faculty office.”

This statement about office hours is located here:
The current university office hour policy predates the proliferation of online communication by many years. Online communication has relieved some of the need for in-person contact in office hours. The Academic Senate offers this interpretation of office hours in its remarks on the university office hour policy on its FAQ webpage after quoting the original CAM office hour policy:

“Can office hours be held online? Many faculty will spend time responding to students email outside of office hours. The University required office hours must be scheduled so students will have access to faculty at specific scheduled times either at a scheduled location or to be held virtually at the scheduled time.”

This Academic Senate statement about office hours is located here:

https://academicsenate.calpoly.edu/content/faq-office-hours

The CLA policy on office hours, distributed annually to its faculty by email, explicitly includes online communication as a basis for reducing the total number of scheduled office hours:

“OFFICE HOURS: Pursuant to university policy (CAM 370.2), all Cal Poly faculty are expected to conduct at least five office hours each week for student consultation. For faculty with reduced teaching schedules and part time faculty, the five hours are reduced in proportion thereof with no less than one face-to-face office hour per week. Faculty have the option of offering 4 hours per week of face-to-face office hours plus 1 hour per week of alternative, but demonstrable, contact with students, such as email or other on-line communication. No prior approval is required, but the format of the alternative hour should be stated in the faculty information about office hours that is given to students, and the contact method must be demonstrable should it ever be necessary to do so. Faculty still have the option of holding 5 hours per week of face-to-face office hours. For full-time faculty, the 4-5 hours of face-to-face office hours must be spread over at least three days. In accordance with this policy, faculty do have a responsibility to respond to student emails, even if it is to let students know about regularly scheduled office hours and ways to schedule an alternate appointment.” (CLA Faculty Information Memo 9/13/2018)

Implementation

The new office hour policy would go into effect no sooner than the term following its enactment by the Academic Senate and ratification by the President. The Academic Senate may propose a later date for enactment, but that should not be later than the following Fall term after ratification by the President.

Colleges need to formulate office hour policies. Any college with formulated and published office hour policies must consider whether their office hour policies are inconsistent with the new university policy. Any inconsistency with university policy must be resolved in their new office hour policy. College level office hour policies would be in Chapter 12 of the college personnel policy documents,
and would be subject to approval the same way that any personnel policy is approved as per UFPP 1.5.5 and 1.5.6.

Current subordinate office hour policies that are roughly in line with the long-standing university policy from CAM 370.2 (such as those in ARCH and CLA) may remain consistent with the new office hour policy. For instance, the subordinate policy from ARCH quoted above requiring five office hours for all faculty would be consistent with a university policy requiring a minimum of less than five because the university policy does not specify a maximum. The subordinate policy from CLA quoted above would also be consistent with the new university policy in its allowance of online modes of office hours even in cases where one’s entire instructional assignment is in normal classroom settings, since it also requires at least as many in-person office hours as the university requires.

What follows is the proposed text of subchapter 12.2...
12.2. Office Hours

12.2.1. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION] This policy supersedes the previous university policy on office hours originally in CAM 370.2.

12.2.2. Cal Poly’s Educational Mission: “Cal Poly is committed to excellence in teaching and learning. In all disciplines, we seek to provide a student-centered, learner-focused education, facilitated by a low student-teacher ratio in classes conducted primarily by full-time, regular faculty. The cornerstone of our educational philosophy is our commitment to Learn by Doing whereby classroom instruction is complemented by practical, hands-on learning in the laboratory, the studio, and the field.” (Cal Poly Catalog)

12.2.3. One-on-one, direct, personal engagement between students and their instructors and faculty advisors in regularly scheduled office hours is a vital means of contributing to the student-centered mission of Cal Poly.

12.2.4. Asynchronous communication (e.g. email) with students and ad hoc appointments to meet with students are expected normal instructional duties distinct from scheduled office hours.

12.2.5. An office hour is one credit hour (i.e. 50 minutes) of regularly scheduled time for faculty to be available to meet in a regularly scheduled location.

12.2.6. Faculty with instructional assignments shall hold scheduled office hours scaled to their instructional assignments. Scheduled office hours should be held during the days and times when classes are normally scheduled, distributed across days and at times suited to the needs of students. During final exam week office hours may be rescheduled as necessary, and should be suited to the needs of the students served in the instructional assignment.

12.2.7. Colleges that assign duties warranting the holding of office hours shall include office hour policies in their personnel policies documents.

12.2.8. Scheduled instructional office hours

12.2.8.1. Minimum weekly office hour scheduling shall be scaled to instructional assignments as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional WTU</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Tenure-Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0 up to and including 4</td>
<td>1 office hour</td>
<td>2 office hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4 up to and including 8</td>
<td>2 office hours</td>
<td>3 office hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 8 up to and including 12</td>
<td>3 office hours</td>
<td>4 office hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 12</td>
<td>4 office hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.2.8.2. Faculty receiving assigned time for teaching large format classes shall schedule office hours according to the total WTU for the instructional assignment and assigned time related to that course.

12.2.8.3. If colleges or departments have any further provisions about the scheduling of office hours, those provisions shall be defined in their personnel policy document.

12.2.9. Scheduled advising office hours

12.2.9.1. Assigned time for advising duties may have an amount of office hours defined as part of the advising function. Any advising office hours attached to assigned time shall be determined by the instructional unit that issues the assigned time and specified in the assignment. Office hours for advising duties earning assigned time contribute to the total office hour obligation of the faculty member.

12.2.9.2. Department chair and head responsibilities shall include the requirements for the scheduling of advising office hours required for their assignment. Colleges shall determine the minimum office hours required for department chairs and heads.
12.2.10. **Mode of office hours**

12.2.10.1. Scheduled office hours should be congruent with the mode of engagement with students for the instructional or advising function that requires the scheduling of the office hours.

12.2.10.2. For normal classroom instruction, scheduled office hours should be held in-person in the faculty member’s office. Faculty with more than one scheduled office hour may hold up to one office hour conducted in a synchronous online mode suited to the nature of the engagement with the affected students.

12.2.10.3. For online courses, scheduled office hours should be conducted in a synchronous online mode suited to the nature of the engagement with the enrolled students.

12.2.10.4. Hybrid courses may warrant an appropriate combination of in-person and synchronous online office hours.

12.2.10.5. Colleges and departments shall specify in their office hour policies any general allowances or requirements for alternate locations or synchronous online modes of conducting office hours.

12.2.11. **Notification**

12.2.11.1. Office hours shall be posted by the beginning of the second week of instruction in faculty listings on department websites. Colleges and instructional units can determine additional ways for posting office hours that conspicuously and conveniently inform the university community of when and where office hours shall be conducted, such as common boards at department offices, on placards near faculty offices, or other online directories.

12.2.11.2. If the university adopts a standard online directory generally accessible to the university community that is capable of presenting faculty schedules, then office hours should be posted in such an online directory.

12.2.11.3. Faculty should notify enrolled students and department administrators and administrative support staff of any need to cancel office hours in a timely manner appropriate to the needs of the students served by those office hours.

12.2.12. **Exceptions**

12.2.12.1. Exceptions to the policies about the scheduling of instructional and advising office hours should coordinate the needs of the instructor and the students given the nature of the instructional or advising assignment.

12.2.12.2. Exceptions require department chair/head and college dean approval.

12.2.12.3. Exceptions should be temporary and specific.

12.2.12.4. Exceptions that extend beyond a specific instructor’s temporary needs should be treated as a basis for revisiting the college or department office hour policies.

12.2.12.5. Colleges and departments with standing needs that deviate from university policy should treat those needs as a basis for asking the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee to revisit university level office hour policies.