I. Minutes: Approval of the January 19, 1999 Academic Senate meeting minutes (pp. 2-3)

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

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President's Office: President Baker will be attending today's meeting to discuss the governor's budget and to answer questions.
C. Provost's Office:
D. Statewide Senators:
E. CFA Campus President:
F. ASI Representative:
G. Other: Vice Provost Conn will present a WASC update.

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
A. Curriculum proposals: Keesey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, second reading (p. 4).
B. Resolution on Policy and Procedures for Resolving University 504/ADA Accommodation Disputes: Bailey, Director for the Disability Resource Center, second reading (pp. 5-8).
C. Resolution to Modify the Definition (Membership) of General Faculty in the Constitution of the General Faculty: Harris, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, second reading (pp. 9-10).
D. Resolution on Revision to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate to Add Academic Senate Faculty Ethics Committee: Executive Committee, first reading (pp. 11-12).
E. Resolution on Credit by Examination Policy: Freberg, chair of the Instruction Committee, first reading (p. 13).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
To: Academic Senate  
From: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC)  
Subject: Course Changes Proposed for 1999-2000 Catalog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASCC Recommendation</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rationale for Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Disapprove</td>
<td>OH 243 Turf Management change to EHS 330</td>
<td>Given the articulation concerns with community colleges, the rationale provided by the EHS department for changing course level to upper division was not met. Additional information was requested, but no response received by Dec 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Postpone</td>
<td>CE 557 Seismic Analysis and Design for Civil Engineers new course</td>
<td>A recommendation regarding this new course is postponed to allow the departments of CE and ARCE to meet in Winter Quarter to discuss coordination of course offerings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Postpone</td>
<td>PSY 563 Counseling Diverse Populations new course</td>
<td>A recommendation regarding this new course is postponed to allow the PSY/HD department and UCTE to meet in Winter Quarter to discuss this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Approved Pending add'l information</td>
<td>IT 375 Packaging Material and Product Testing new course IT 408, IT 409, IT 435 uninc.</td>
<td>It was unclear whether these courses will be required in the Packaging Minor and what effect the increase in units will have. Industrial Technology was asked to provide the curriculum display for the Minor. Since Packaging is an interdisciplinary minor with FSN &amp; GRC, sign-off on notification memos are needed. As of Dec 11 no response received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Approved Pending add'l information</td>
<td>LIB 304 Information Competence new course</td>
<td>There were several unresolved questions regarding the course and the instructor was asked to provide additional information. As of Dec 11 no response received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Not approved to fulfill USCP requirement</td>
<td>DANC 311 BUS 481 MU 221 SPAN 123</td>
<td>The recommendation of the U. S. Cultural Pluralism subcommittee was not to approve these courses for USCP. The Senate Curriculum Committee concurs with the recommendation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, Cal Poly, and its Academic Senate, have stated commitments supporting campus diversity—which includes persons with disabilities—in its University Strategic Plan (revised January 26, 1996), and several Academic Senate resolutions on diversity (most recently AS-505-98/DTF “Resolution on the Academic Value of Diversity” and AS-506-98/DTF “Resolution on The Cal Poly Statement on Diversity”); and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly has publicly stated its commitment in official publications (e.g., catalog, job announcements, etc.) to compliance with Section 504 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA); and

WHEREAS, Federal law (34 C.F.R., Section 104.7; 28 C.F.R., Section 35.107) requires that the University adopt and publish a grievance procedure; and

WHEREAS, The existing Student Grievance Procedure was written over 10 years ago, prior to the signing of the ADA, and does not adequately address the current needs of the campus; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate at Cal Poly accept and endorse the attached Policy and Procedures for the Resolution of 504/ADA Accommodation Disputes.

Proposed by: Cal Poly Disability Resource Center and Ombud Services and Educational Equity Programs
Date: January 5, 1999
Revised: January 19, 1999
Introduction
It is the policy of California Polytechnic State University that “otherwise qualified” students who have disabilities shall have access to academic adjustments and auxiliary aids necessary to accommodate functional limitations (resulting from verified disabilities) impairing one or more major life activities. Accommodations are generally determined on an individual basis. Students must verify their disability through the campus Disability Resource Center (DRC) and are encouraged to identify their needs as early as possible.

This document describes the remedies available to students, staff, and faculty in the event that there is a dispute regarding the appropriateness of a particular student accommodation. Every effort will be made to resolve the dispute as expeditiously as possible. During the time that the accommodation is under review, the DRC recommendation for accommodation will remain in effect.

The following procedures have been developed in response to Section 504 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Americans with Disabilities Act, State of California ACR 201 (1976), ACR 3 (1985), AB 746 (1987), and the “Policy for the Provision of Services to Students with Disabilities,” coded memorandum AAES 89-07, The California State University system.

Informal Resolution Procedures
Students, faculty, or staff should attempt to resolve disputes informally with either the party alleged to have committed the violation, and/or with the head of the department or unit in which the alleged violation occurred. There is no requirement that a complainant utilize these informal procedures before filing a formal complaint. Experience has shown that the majority of complaints can be effectively resolved through the informal process. In the interest of efficiency all complainants are encouraged to resolve disputes via these informal processes when possible. The Office of Campus Student Relations and Judicial Affairs and the Disability Resource Center are available to provide advisory, mediation, and conciliation services to students raising such complaints.

Formal Resolution
To initiate the formal resolution process, a written complaint must be filed with the Office of Campus Student Relations and Judicial Affairs (CSRJA) within thirty (30) calendar days of the time the complainant could reasonably be expected to have had knowledge of the injury allegedly caused by the discriminatory action. The Director of CSRJA will refer the complaint to the appropriate campus vice president (Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Student Affairs, Vice President for Administration and Finance, or Vice President for Advancement). Complaints must include the following information:

(a) the complainant’s name, address, and phone number;
(b) the specific act(s) or circumstance(s) alleged to constitute the discriminatory actions that are the basis of the complaint, including the time and place of the alleged discriminatory action; and
(c) the remedy requested.

Formal Complaint Resolution Procedures

1. The Director of CSRJA will direct the complaint to the appropriate campus vice president (Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Student Affairs, Vice President for Administration and Finance, or Vice President for Advancement). The vice president, or her/his designee, will, within five (5) working days, evaluate the complaint and send the complaint to the appropriate department chair, department head, or director for resolution.

2. If the department chair, department head, or director is unable to resolve the dispute within five (5) working days, it will be referred to the Accommodation Review Board (ARB) by the vice president/designee.

3. The ARB will review the complaint to decide if the complaint appears to have merit. If the ARB decides the complaint has merit, a hearing will be scheduled. The ARB findings and recommendations will be forwarded to the appropriate vice president/designee within fifteen (15) working days of receiving the case for review.

4. The vice president/designee will issue an implementation letter within ten (10) working days of receipt of the ARB recommendation. The vice president/designee has the authority to accept, reject, or modify the recommendations of the ARB. The vice president/designee’s decision is final and ends the formal University 504/ADA Accommodation Disputes resolution process.

Accommodation Review Board

Members of the Accommodation Review Board are appointed by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the Academic Senate for two year terms. Terms shall be staggered to ensure continuity. Membership shall include:

(a) two (2) faculty members (nominated by the Academic Senate);
(b) one (1) associate dean (nominated by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs);
(c) one student member with no less than junior standing and three consecutive quarters of attendance at Cal Poly preceding the appointment (nominated by the current ASI President for a one year term);
(d) one Student Affairs director (nominated by the Vice President for Student Affairs);
(e) the Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Undergraduate Education.

The following are designated as ex officio nonvoting members:

a. the Coordinator of Campus Student Relations and Judicial Affairs or designee;
b. the Director of the Disability Resource Center or designee, and
c. the University ADA/504 Compliance Officer.

The Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Undergraduate Education shall serve as the chairperson of the ARB.
Hearing Procedures

1. The chairperson of the ARB upon receipt of the complaint will schedule a meeting of the ARB. A quorum shall consist of five (5) voting members, one (1) of whom must be a faculty representative.

2. In order to avoid potential conflicts of interest, Board members may excuse themselves if they have a significant direct involvement in the dispute. They will be replaced temporarily by a designee selected by the nominating authority of the excused member.

3. The ARB will allow each principal party, who may be accompanied by an advisor, to present her/his case personally, call and question witnesses and present exhibits. The Board may request copies of any materials it believes are relevant to the hearing. If the complainant or her/his advisor is an attorney, the ARB chairperson must be notified in writing of that fact prior to the scheduling of the hearing. In such cases, the University will be represented by the University Legal Counsel.

4. Each Board member may ask questions of either party or any witnesses.

5. The Board itself may call witnesses or recall witnesses.

6. The Board will keep a summary file of each case and will tape record the hearing.

7. The Board will close the hearing when it is satisfied that both sides have been heard.

8. The Board will deliberate in private.

9. Decisions will be reached by simple majority vote with the Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Undergraduate Education voting only when needed to break a tie.

10. The chairperson of the Board will send a copy of its recommendation to the appropriate vice president/designee.

11. Should any Board member wish to file a minority recommendation, it will be attached to the Board’s majority recommendation.

Training for the Board will be provided annually by the University’s ADA/504 Compliance Officer and the Office of the Disability Resource Center.
Whereas, Changes in the Collective Bargaining Agreement Between The Board of Trustees of The California State University and The California Faculty Association, Unit 3 – Faculty since the last publication of the Constitution of the Faculty have expanded CFA's representation of general faculty to include faculty in the Pre-retirement Reduction in Time Base Program, full-time coaches holding faculty appointments of one year or more, and full-time probationary and permanent employees in Professional Consultative Services; therefore, be it

Resolved: That Article I, Membership of the General Faculty, as defined in the Constitution of the Faculty be modified as follows:

Article I. Membership of the General Faculty

Voting members of the General Faculty shall consist solely of those persons who are full-time academic employees holding faculty rank and occupying a position in an academic department, according to their appointment, within the university and faculty in the Pre-retirement Reduction in Time Base Program regardless of time base. Department chairs, department heads, center directors, officers of the faculty and representatives to The California State University Academic Senate will not cease to be members of the General Faculty because of any reassigned time allotted to them by virtue of their offices. Full-time coaches holding faculty appointment of one year of more in an academic department or equivalent unit, personnel full-time probationary and permanent employees in Professional Consultative Services, as defined in Article III.1.b of the Constitution, and full-time lecturers holding appointments of one year or more in academic departments are members of the General Faculty. Faculty whose appointments are full time for an academic quarter are considered members of the General Faculty during each quarter of their full-time appointment. Voting
membership of the General Faculty shall lapse during a leave of absence if the leave is one year or longer. Nonvoting membership in the General Faculty shall include all temporary, part-time academic personnel not included in the voting membership.

Voting members of the General Faculty of Cal Poly shall consist of those persons who are employed at Cal Poly and belong to at least one of the following entities:

1. Full time academic employees holding faculty rank whose principal duty is within an academic department, unit, or program;
2. Faculty members in the Pre-retirement Reduction in Time Base Program;
3. Full time probationary and/or permanent employees in Professional Consultative Services, as defined in Article III.1.b of this Constitution;
4. Full time coaches holding a current faculty appointment of at least one year;
5. Lecturers holding appointments of at least one year in an academic department, unit, or program; and
6. Lecturers with a current assignment of 15 WTUs for at least three consecutive quarters.

Members of the General Faculty, including department chairs/heads, shall not cease to be members because of any assigned time allotted to them for the carrying out of duties consistent with their employment at Cal Poly. "Visiting Personnel" shall not be members of the General Faculty. Members of the General Faculty who are on leave for at least one year shall not be voting members during their leave.

and, be it further

RESOLVED: That upon Academic Senate approval of this modification, and in accordance with Article IV, Amendments, of the Constitution of the Faculty, said modification be submitted to the General Faculty for its adoption by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: January 5, 1999
Revised February 1, 1999
WHEREAS, The Academic Senate adopted AS-501-98/ETF, Resolution on Faculty Dispute Process, on June 2, 1998 (attached); and

WHEREAS, President Baker approved Academic Senate resolution AS-501-98/ETF, Resolution on Faculty Dispute Process, on January 6, 1999; and

WHEREAS, The Resolution on Faculty Dispute Process establishes a formal process for dealing with faculty grievances involving other faculty members; and

WHEREAS, The Resolution on Faculty Dispute Process calls for the establishment of a Faculty Ethics Committee; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Ethics Committee be added to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate as follows:

VIII. COMMITTEES
I. SPECIAL STANDING COMMITTEES
1. Faculty Awards
2. Faculty Ethics Committee
3. Fairness Board
4. Grants Review
5. Program Review and Improvement
6. Student Grievance Board

K. COMMITTEE DESCRIPTIONS OF SPECIAL STANDING COMMITTEES
2. Faculty Ethics Committee
   a. Membership
   The Faculty Ethics Committee shall consist of 7 tenured faculty members appointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for a two-year term and representing
each of the colleges and Professional Consultative Services. Responsibilities
The committee shall develop procedures appropriate to its functions and shall make
periodic reports of its activities to the Academic Senate and to the Provost/Vice
President for Academic Affairs. For all disputes that fall within its jurisdiction, the
Faculty Ethics Committee shall have the authority to conduct an investigation of the
dispute and to make recommendations to the Provost/Vice President for Academic
Affairs.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
January 26, 1999
WHEREAS, Current Cal Poly policy allows a regularly enrolled student to petition for credit by examination in courses in which he or she is qualified through previous education or experience and for which credit has not otherwise been given; and

WHEREAS, Current Cal Poly policy is less specific than policies common at other CSU campuses, leading to undesirable outcomes such as entire minors being administered through credit by examination and the use of credit by examination to “fix” late enrollment problems; be it therefore

RESOLVED: That the number of units a student may take through credit by examination be limited to 16 units; and be it further

RESOLVED: That grades for a course taken through Credit by Examination be submitted no later than the end of the fourth week of the quarter with the grade being posted for that quarter.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee
October 12, 1998
Dear Senators:

This memo outlines the course content for MU 221, Jazz Styles, and explains why I believe this class should be designated as a USCP class. MU 221 is a survey class in jazz history, and includes listening assignments while also addressing issues of ethnicity and racism within the context of a chronological review of jazz history.

For your reference, the guidelines for USCP classes follow below:

A. Objectives (AS-361-91)

1. To bring greater multicultural perspective to all Cal Poly students;
2. to foster greater understanding of cultural and ethnic differences in the United States and in relation to a wider world;
3. to help students appreciate differing cultural values and assumptions and the "relativity of otherness;"
4. to nurture tolerance for and enjoyment of cultural diversity; and
5. to encourage American commonalities and continuities amidst diversity.

B. Requirements

1. Beginning with the 1994-97 Catalog, students are required to complete one USCP course. (AS-395-92/CC)
2. This requirement will be fulfilled by courses in Major, Support, General Education and Breadth (GEB), or Free Elective category. (AS-395-92/CC)

C. Criteria - United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP) courses fulfill the following criteria: (AS-395-92/CC)

1. Emphasis on one or more of these four U.S. cultures: Asian American, African American, Hispanic American, American Indian;
2. Attention to general issues of gender, diversity, equity, ethnocentrism, and ethnicity; and the relationships to problems facing contemporary society, especially those resulting from racism, discrimination and cultural conflict;
3. Application of rigorous pedagogical, scholarly methods and standards as evidenced in substantive exams, reports, papers, and projects; and
4. Attention to critical thinking skills which will allow students to address cultural, racial, and gender issues in a sensitive and responsible manner and to evaluate their own attitudes and those of others.
MU 221 meets the criteria for cultural pluralism classes in the following manner:

**Criterion #1 - Emphasis on US cultures**

Jazz Styles emphasizes music made by African-Americans. Nearly all of the jazz musicians that the class emphasizes are African-American.

**Criterion #2A - Equity, ethnocentrism, and ethnicity**

While MU 221, Jazz Styles is organized as a chronological survey of major jazz styles and artists, important issues concerning cultural pluralism are addressed for most major styles and artists. Examples of such issues are listed in the chronological order of styles and artists as presented in class on page 2.

An important issue of ethnicity, the continuing influence of African and European elements in jazz throughout its history, is tracked throughout the entire quarter.

**Criterion #2B - Problems facing contemporary society**

The major paper for the course concerns Wynton Marsalis' leadership at the Lincoln Center Jazz Program, critiques of which have focused on racial issues.

**Criterion #3 - Rigorous methods and standards**

Students in this class are required to take two exams (midterm and final) including multiple-choice questions and a listening component, write a paper on the Lincoln Center (see criterion #2B above), and write a concert review.

**Criterion #4 - Critical thinking skills**

One class session is a discussion of the critiques of the Lincoln Center as well as defenses to those critiques and student's own opinions. During this discussion students apply critical thinking skills to the racial issues inherent this topic (for instance, on what basis should one accept a critique or a defense dealing with such racial topics?).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Style or Artist</th>
<th>USCP topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>African and European elements in the creation of jazz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The origins of jazz</td>
<td>Mix of ethnicities in New Orleans helping to create jazz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Orleans style</td>
<td>Creole/Uptown sections of African-American society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louis Armstrong</td>
<td>Criticism of Armstrong's role as an entertainer and accusations of Tomism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chicago style</td>
<td>Racial division between Chicago-style artists and New Orleans artists in Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bix Beiderbecke</td>
<td>Swing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Racial integration in jazz despite racism and discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Count Basie</td>
<td>“Black, Brown, and Beige” as history of blacks in America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duke Ellington</td>
<td>Bebop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The perception by blacks that whites made the money playing black music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Charlie Parker &amp; Dizzy Gillespie</td>
<td>Thelonious Monk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Billie Holiday, Ella Fitzgerald, Sarah Vaughan</td>
<td>Role of women as singers in jazz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effects of racism and discrimination on Billie Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cool jazz</td>
<td>Hard bop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Derivation of style characteristics from African influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Free jazz</td>
<td>Miles Davis (1950s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Derivation of style characteristics from African influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ornette Coleman</td>
<td>The strong connections musicians made between the civil rights movement and free jazz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Coltrane</td>
<td>Censorship of racially charged topics ( Mingus )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bill Evans</td>
<td>Influence of African and Indian music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jazz/rock</td>
<td>Miles Davis (1960s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weather Report</td>
<td>Chick Corea &amp; McCoy Tyner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Derivation of style characteristics from African influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Neo-Jazz</td>
<td>Wynton Marsalis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On behalf of the USCP Subcommittee I want to thank you for the time and effort it took to write up your course proposal. We do want to encourage Cal Poly faculty members to develop USCP courses.

We have reviewed the course proposal for MU 221. Paul, it is the committee's opinion that -- given the information included in the MU 221 proposal -- the course does not meet the four established USCP criteria. Below I have copied the relevant points from the minutes of our committee meeting:

MU 221

1) Specific information, including topics and issues is needed to show how the course relates to cultural pluralism.
2) More information is needed on how the course connects the history of jazz to cultural pluralism. The main focus appears to be on music appreciation and listening skills rather than on the historical events.
3) Demonstrate how the course content focuses on issues of culture and jazz and how these topics are intertwined.
4) Show how USCP topics mentioned under section III C. are integrated into the weekly schedule listed under section III A.
5) Demonstrate how issues of gender are incorporated in the course content.
6) Information is needed to substantiate that the course satisfies the 4 USCP criteria with particular attention to the second criterion.

The consensus of the USCP Subcommittee members was that this course has the potential to satisfy the USCP criteria. However it was also the consensus that more information is needed before a recommendation could be made to include the course in the USCP program. More detailed evidence is needed to demonstrate that this is more than a "listening skills" or "music appreciation" course. Evidence is needed to tie the course content to specific concepts, issues, and methodology employed to focus on cultural pluralism. One committee member suggested one possible approach, which was outlined in an article by Peter Monaghan: "The Riffs of Jazz Inspire Social and Political Studies of Black Music," The Chronicle of Higher Education, May 1, 1998, p. A 1.

Paul, I want to assure you that this decision is no reflection on the quality of the course. By resolution of the Academic Senate we are required to base our evaluation of USCP course proposals solely on the four established criteria for USCP courses.

If you have any questions about our decision, please do not hesitate to contact me. I will be happy to explain our decision. Thanks.
CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY

Preamble
We, the faculty of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, in order to meet our academic responsibilities, hereby establish this Constitution for our governance. The responsibilities of the faculty, the powers necessary to fulfill those responsibilities and the collegial form of governance are based on historic academic traditions, which have been recognized by the people of the State of California through their Legislature.

Article I. Membership of the General Faculty

Voting members of the General Faculty shall consist solely of those persons who are full-time academic employees holding faculty rank and occupying a position in an academic department according to their appointment, within the university. Department chairs/heads, center directors, officers of the faculty and representatives to The California State University Academic Senate will not cease to be members of the General Faculty because of any reassigned time allotted to them by virtue of their offices. Personnel in Professional Consultative Services, as defined in Article III.1.b. of this Constitution, and full-time lecturers holding appointments of one year or more in academic departments are members of the General Faculty. Faculty whose appointments are full-time for an academic quarter are considered members of the General Faculty during each quarter of their full-time appointment. Voting membership of the General Faculty shall lapse during a leave of absence if the leave is one year or longer. Nonvoting membership in the General Faculty shall include all temporary, part-time academic personnel not included in the voting membership.

Article II. Rights, Responsibilities, and Powers of the General Faculty

Section 1. Rights of the General Faculty

The right of academic freedom is necessary for the pursuit and dissemination of truth and the maintenance of a free society. It is the obligation of the General Faculty to insure the preservation of an academic community with full freedom of inquiry and expression, and insulation from political influence.

Voting members of the General Faculty have the right to nominate, elect, and recall members of the Academic Senate and the right to call for, participate in, and vote at meetings of the General Faculty.

Section 2. Responsibilities of the General Faculty

The primary responsibility of members of the General Faculty is to seek truth and to encourage the free pursuit of learning in their peers and students. To this end, they devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that their evaluation of students and peers reflects true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation of students for their private advantage, acknowledge significant assistance from them, and protect their freedom of inquiry.
The Academic Senate met on Tuesday, February 9, 1999.

Minutes of the 1/19/99 meeting were approved.

*Communications and Announcements

President Baker was unexpectedly unable to attend today's meeting and has rescheduled for the March 2nd meeting.

*Reports

CHAIR (Myron Hood)

Gene Dinielli and Harold Goldwhite will not be at the 3/2/99 meeting. Goldwhite has been invited to the 4/13/99 meeting, or a special meeting may be scheduled to allow both to be here.

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE: No report

PROVOST'S OFFICE: (Paul Zingg)

Zingg reported on the Tentative Agreement between CSU and CFA. Two critical issues are the timing of the merit increases, and the difference between the old SSI's (Salary Step Increase) and the new FMI's (Faculty Merit Increase). The SSI's used to be "fairly automatic", now there is no guarantee--faculty must be reviewed before they receive the FMI. The vote on the Tentative Agreement is scheduled to be completed by 2/28/99.

CFA: (Phil Petzer)

Summaries of the Tentative Agreement will be distributed to all departments. The full contract is available on the web at:
www.calfac.org
There will be a General Faculty meeting on Wednesday, 2/17/99, in Bus 213, 7:00 PM. The State VP of CFA will be there to answer questions on the TA. Petzer recommends a "no" vote, based on the conflicting definition of what merits an FMI--"meritorious" or "satisfactory" performance.

STATEWIDE SENATE (Tim Kersten)

Statewide Senators are going to Sacramento to lobby for additional funding in the Governor's budget for CSU. Kersten also spoke against the creation by Statewide Senate of system wide criteria for FMI's.

ASI: no report

Special Report: (Vice Provost Conn)

WASC update: The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation is necessary in order to obtain federal funding. Cal Poly is in the "innovative mode", which means that we have chosen our topic for self-study, "Cal Poly as a Center of Learning". The WASC committee and subcommittees are looking at three campus environments: intellectual, physical, and social (campus climate). Every faculty and staff member will receive a survey, and some faculty will be asked to
allow WASC to administer a survey in their classes. WASC reports must be written by the end of Spring quarter. The reports will be combined and synthesized during the summer, and available in Fall. The report goes to WASC in January, 2000; and the WASC full team visit occurs in March, 2000.

SPECIAL REPORT: (Jerry Hanley)
Hanley would like to bring information to the next Senate Executive Committee meeting on "polyratings", the web page which contains faculty ratings. The Technical Use Policy committee is discussing acceptable uses of university resources such as ResNet.

*Business Items

A. Curriculum proposals

A. The Curriculum Committee's recommended course change proposals were approved, except for MU 221, which is still pending approval as fulfilling the U. S. Cultural Pluralism requirement.

B. Resolution on Policy and Procedures for Resolving University 504/ADA Accommodation Disputes. Resolution was passed.

C. Resolution to Modify the Definition (Membership) of General Faculty in the Constitution of the General Faculty. Resolution was continued to the March 2nd meeting because the Senate ran out of time.

The remaining items on this agenda will be on the agenda for the next meeting, March 2, 1999.

-Pat Harris, Vice-Chair