Meeting of the
Academic Senate
Tuesday, April 14 1998
UU220, 3:00-5:00pm

I. Minutes: Approval of minutes for the Academic Senate meetings of February 10 and March 3, 1998 (pp. 2-6).

II. Communication(s) and announcement(s):
   A. Academic Senate Membership for 1998-1999 (pp. 7-8).
   B. Nominations for the positions of Academic Senate Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary for the 1998-1999 year are being received. If you are interested in applying for one of these positions, please contact the Academic Senate office for an application.

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair:
   B. President's Office:
   C. Provost's Office:
   D. Statewide senators:
   E. CFA campus president:
   F. Staff Council representative:
   G. ASI representatives:
   H. Other:

IV. Consent agenda:

V. Business item(s):
   A. Resolution on Integrated Modes of Instruction: Freberg, Chair of the Instruction Committee, second reading (p. 9).
   B. Resolution on External Review: Riener, Chair of the Program Review and Improvement Committee, second reading (pp. 10-11).
   C. Resolution to Approve Procedures for External Program Review: Riener, Chair of the Program Review and Improvement Committee, second reading (pp. 12-17).
   D. Resolution on Information Competence: Lant, Chair of the Information Competence Committee, first reading (pp. 18-19).
   E. Resolution for Development of a Research Infrastructure at Cal Poly: Cano, Chair of the Research and Professional Development Committee, first reading (pp. 20-23).
   F. Resolution on Creation of a Permanent Director for a Faculty Development Center: Harris, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading (p. 24).
   G. Resolution on Faculty Input for Academic Administrator Selection: Harris, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading (p. 25).
   H. Resolution on Difference-in-Pay Leaves: Harris, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading (p. 26).
   I. Resolution on Dean Evaluation Form: Harris, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading (pp. 27-30).
   J. Resolution on Student Grievance Process: Greenwald, for the Ethics Task Force, first reading (pp. 31-33).
   K. Resolution on Faculty Dispute Process: Greenwald, for the Ethics Task Force, first reading (pp. 34-45).

VI. Discussion item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
ACADEMIC SENATE MEMBERSHIP for 1998-1999

[Highlighted names indicate newly elected members]

**COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE (7 representatives)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brown, Wyatt</th>
<th>Crop Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hannings, David</td>
<td>Environmental Horticulture Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, John</td>
<td>NRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord, Sarah</td>
<td>Agricultural Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Keefe, Tim</td>
<td>NRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokes, Cliff</td>
<td>Animal Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN (6 representatives)**

| Borland, Jim | Construction Management |
| Botwin, Mike | Architectural Engineering |
| Clay, Gary | Landscape Architecture |
| Dubbink, David | City & Regional Planning |
| VACANCY | |
| VACANCY | |

**COLLEGE OF BUSINESS (5 representatives)**

| Armstrong, MaryBeth | Accounting |
| Bertozzi, Dan | Global Strategy & Law |
| Labhard, Lezlie | Industrial Technology |
| Li, Eldon | Management |
| Swartz, Terri | Marketing |

**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING (7 representatives)**

| Beug, James | Computer Science |
| Cummings, Russ | Aeronautical Engineering |
| Harris, James | Electrical Engineering |
| Johnson, Mark | Mechanical Engineering |
| LoCascio, James | Mechanical Engineering |
| Morrobel-Sosa, Anny | Materials Engineering |
| Yang, Tao | Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering |

**COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS (9 representatives)**

| Bergman, Sky | Art & Design |
| Coleman, Jim | Social Sciences |
| Evnine, Simon | Philosophy |
| Fetzer, Phil | Political Science |
| McLamore, Alyson | Music |
| Rubba, Johanna | English |
| Scriven, Tal | Philosophy |
| Valencia-Laver, Debra | Psychology & Human Development |
| Yang, Phil | Ethnic Studies |
COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS (8 representatives)
Brown, Ron Physics
Hood, Myron Math
Jacobson, Ralph Chemistry & Biochemistry
Marcier, John Chemistry & Biochemistry
Rogers, John Statistics
Walters, Dirk Biological Sciences
VACANCY
VACANCY

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES (4 representatives)
Breitenbach, Stacey CENG Advising Center
Dimmitt, Laura Financial Aid Office
Domingues, Tony Admissions Offices
Harris, Pat Student Life & Activities

UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (1 representative)
Scheftic, Carol UCTE

STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE (3 representatives)
Gooden, Reg CLA
Hale, Tom CSM
Kersten, Tim CBUS
WHEREAS, Faculty have developed new and effective modes of integrated instruction, such as the studio/lab; and

WHEREAS, The campus and CSU administrations have supported new modes of instruction by providing funds and facilities; and

WHEREAS, Current system and campus policies regarding facility use, scheduling and faculty assigned time do not always accommodate these new modes of instruction, causing considerable difficulties for faculty and students; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the development of new instructional modes as intrinsic to the evolution of current curriculum and pedagogy of the University; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Chair of the Academic Senate be charged with communicating this Resolution to the Statewide Academic Senate; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate shall request that the President communicate to the CSU administration the need to update system policies regarding facilities use, scheduling, and faculty assigned time in order to accommodate these new modes of instruction; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That Curriculum Committee course proposal paperwork be updated to reflect flexibility in modes of instruction.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee
January 15, 1998
Revised February 12, 1998
Background

The purpose of external review is to provide the opportunity for objective outside evaluation of academic programs and departments. For some academic programs, accreditation review serves this purpose. For programs which are not subject to accreditation review, formal external review should occur.

In academic departments that offer more than one degree, external review of the degree programs may be combined into a single review. Non-degree granting academic departments will also undergo external review. Where accreditation review occurs at the College level, this review can be considered as an external review of a program within the college as long as the accreditation report makes substantive comments about individual programs within the College.

Interdisciplinary degree programs may be evaluated by a single external review, as long as the review team is appropriately constituted.

RESOLUTION ON EXTERNAL REVIEW

WHEREAS, the Academic Senate approved a resolution (AS460-96/PRAIC) calling for External Review of Academic Programs, which was approved by the President's office, but with a number of procedural changes, and

WHEREAS, the Program Review and Improvement Committee in 1997 further revised the resolution, to improve coordination between accreditation and internal Program Review, but the revised Resolution was returned to the Program Review and Improvement Committee by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, thus leaving the status of the original resolution unresolved, and

WHEREAS, The Commitment to Visionary Pragmatism document has identified external program review as necessary; and

WHEREAS, specialized accreditation is not available for some degree programs or available accreditation may be deemed unnecessary by the department and the Chief Academic Officer, be it therefore
RESOLVED, that all degree programs, in consultation with their college dean, will either undergo external review as part of specialized accreditation review if there is a suitable accrediting body, or separately will undergo external review following guidelines for external review, as specified by AS-YYY-98; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the timing of external review be coordinated with the Academic Senate Program Review & Improvement Committee to minimize the workload of the program faculty in preparing for review; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the results of specialized accreditation review or external review will be communicated to the college dean, the Academic Senate Program Review & Improvement Committee, and to the President or his/her designee; and be it further

RESOLVED, that program faculty will have an opportunity to respond in writing to all findings and recommendations raised during the review process; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the President or his/her designee will report to the program, the college dean, and to the Academic Senate Program Review & Improvement Committee within six months regarding recommendations made to the program during the review process.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee
RESOLUTION TO APPROVE PROCEDURES 
FOR EXTERNAL PROGRAM REVIEW 

AS-yyy-98/PRAIC 

WHEREAS, the Academic Senate approved a resolution (AS461-96/PRAIC) outlining procedures for External Review of Academic Programs, which was approved by the President's office, but with a number of procedural changes, and

WHEREAS, the Program Review and Improvement Committee in 1997 further revised the resolution, to improve coordination between accreditation and internal Program Review, but the revised Resolution was returned to the Program Review and Improvement Committee by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, thus leaving the status of the original resolution unresolved, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the attached procedures for external program review be approved, and be it further

RESOLVED, the attached procedures for external program review be forwarded to the President for approval and implementation.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee
PROCEDURES FOR EXTERNAL PROGRAM REVIEW

The purpose of external program review is to provide the opportunity for outside evaluation of academic programs and departments, resulting in suggestions for program improvement. The purpose of this document is to provide minimum standards for external review of programs which are not accredited. Many accreditation reviews will meet or exceed these minimum standards, and will serve as the only required external review.

Coordination between Internal Review and External Review

The schedule for internal review will be coordinated with external review. It is recommended that internal review by the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee occur the year after the program is scheduled for external review, so that the effort is not duplicated.

Accredited programs (or programs seeking accreditation) with accreditation schedules of four, five, or six years will undergo internal Program Review the year after their accreditation review. Programs with three year accreditation cycles will undergo internal program review after every other accreditation review, and the two most recent reviews will be submitted with the internal program review material. Programs with accreditation cycles of seven or more years will undergo internal review the year after accreditation, as well as at least once between accreditation reviews, so that no more than five years will elapse between internal reviews.

Programs which are not accredited by a major accrediting agency in their discipline will undergo external review every five years, followed by internal review the following year. Thus, all programs, whether accredited or unaccredited, will undergo external review on a regular basis.

The Review Panel

The review panel will be composed of at least three persons not affiliated with Cal Poly. The panel will include at least one academic representative of the discipline from another institution, and may include a representative from industry or a public agency where appropriate. The panel may also include an academic member from a closely related discipline or an academic administrator.

The selection of reviewers should involve consultative offices beyond those of the department chair(s) and dean(s), and should include national professional associations, accrediting bodies, other institutions, and appropriate organizations to identify qualified reviewers. The list of reviewers should be determined through mutual agreement of the department, college and Chief Academic Officer.
One of the members of the review team (preferably an academic member) will be selected to chair the committee. The chair will be responsible for submitting a final report.

Preparation for Review

A valuable component of the program review process will be a self-study conducted by the faculty and staff of the program. Such a self-study, which is required as part of the process for specialized accreditation, goes beyond the mere collection of data and entails a thorough examination of the various aspects of the program. A self-study should be conducted as part of an external program review.

In preparation for external review, the following items are to be submitted to the reviewers at least one month prior to their campus visit:

1. Faculty vitae

2. Statement of department/program mission, goals, and objectives. This should be accompanied by an assessment of how well the program has met its mission and accomplished its goals and objectives. This assessment might take a variety of forms and address several measures, such as those suggested in the WASC material on assessment, in "Commitment to Visionary Pragmatism," the discussions of the Cal Poly Plan, and other campus documents. This information should be consistent with information requested in program and course proposals.

3. Curricular requirements, including a comparison to similar programs in California and the nation.

4. An expanded course outline, statement of learning objectives, and syllabus for each course offered by the department/program. Samples of course materials, student work, exams and other assessments, grading policy, and grade distributions need not be sent prior to the visit unless requested by the review team, but should be available for review during the campus visit.

5. Description of relevant facilities, including library and computer facilities.

6. Program data, including:
   1. Faculty demographics and faculty recruiting plan
   2. Student demographics and student recruitment efforts
   3. Demand for the program, including number of applications received and percent admitted.
4. Average GPA and SAT scores for entering students and MCA criteria
5. Retention and graduation rates
6. Assessment of job market for graduating students
7. Awards and honors received by students (please specify)
8. Involvement with the professional community and industry

Campus Visit

The department/program will develop a schedule for the campus visit. The campus visit should include meetings with department/program faculty individually or in small groups, meetings with appropriate administrators including the Department/program Chair/Head, Dean, and Chief Academic Officer, and a meeting with representative students. The campus visit should conclude with an exit interview with the Department/Program Chair/Head, the Dean, and the Chief Academic Officer.

Reviewer Guidelines

Reviewers should consider the following issues in conducting their review, and should address these issues in their report:

1. Department/Program Objectives
   a. What are the program goals of the department/program for the next five years?
   b. Are department/program goals and objectives judged to be appropriate given general trends in the discipline?
   c. How does the department/program plan to meet its five-year goals?
   d. How will the department/program assess how well it has met the goals and objectives listed above?

2. Academic Program
   a. Program
      i. How does the academic program compare to that of comparable institutions?
      ii. What are the distinguishing features of the academic program?
      iii. What significant changes have been made in the academic program in the last five years?
      iv. Is the department/program offering the number and variety of courses appropriate to the size of the faculty and program needs—that is, neither too many nor too few courses.
v. What is this program's relationship to the co-curriculum, and Student Affairs?

b. Curricular Content
   i. Are there emerging trends or areas within the discipline which should be included or expanded in the curriculum?
   ii. Are there out-of-date elements which should be phased out or deleted?

c. Instructional Methods
   i. Are instructional methods employed and use of technology appropriate given the learning objectives of the program?

d. Learning Objectives
   i. Are course learning objectives appropriate and linked to observable behaviors that demonstrate or imply competence?
   ii. What evidence is there about the degree to which students attain these objectives?

e. Strengths and Weaknesses
   i. In what ways could the program be strengthened and improved?

3. Faculty
   a. What are the department/program's statement/s and definition/s of activities acceptable as professional development, scholarship, research, and creative activity?
   b. Are the faculty active in curricular development, instructional design, and university service?
   c. Is there an appropriate level of professional development across the department/program faculty?
   d. What research and creative projects are each of the department/program faculty pursuing?
   e. What consulting and special projects are each of the faculty pursuing, and how are they linked to the academic program?
   f. Is there an appropriate faculty recruitment plan that addresses gender and ethnic diversity goals, consistent with the principles in the Mission Statement of the University?
4. Summary

a. Is the department/program meeting its program, instructional, and learning objectives?
b. What are the strengths and achievements of the program?
c. What suggestions for improvement can be made?
d. What are the most important challenges facing the department/program?

Written Report

The chair of the review team is responsible for the written report organized around the above guidelines. A draft report should be submitted to the Department/Program for an accuracy check of factual information at least 10 days prior to submission of the final report. The final written report should be submitted no later than 45 days after the review. The report will be submitted to the Chief Academic Officer, with copies to the Dean and Department/Program Chair.

The process for responding should complement the regular review schedule of the Program Review and Improvement Committee.

Expenses

The Chief Academic Officer will cover the expenses of external review.

Post Review Recommendations

The President or his/her designee will respond to the department/program, the college dean, and the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee within six months regarding the recommendations of the external review team. The department/program, in consultation with the Dean, will respond to any concerns, problems, or issues identified in the external review and in the President’s response by developing an action plan that addresses these issues. The department's/program's response and action plan shall be presented to the Program Review and Improvement Committee, which will work in consultation and collaboration with the department/program to implement the plan and monitor its progress.
ACADEMIC SENATE
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA
AS--98/RESOLUTION ON INFORMATION COMPETENCE

WHEREAS the new GE template recommended by the Academic Senate and approved by President Baker eliminates the previous computer literacy requirement (Area F1);

WHEREAS the new GE template contains no provision for directly ensuring information competence, but asserts that it is a responsibility of the university to ensure the information competence of all its students (See Academic Senate Resolution approving the new GE&B model #47897, 03/17/97);

WHEREAS the university Information Competence Committee has been charged by the senate and President Baker to make recommendations on competency levels and implementation methods for entering, continuing, and graduating students with respect to information competence;

WHEREAS no standards have yet been set by the state concerning information competence skills of graduating high school students;

BE IT RESOLVED that, with respect to entering freshmen students, the Information Competence Committee will continue to study and report on their preparation in information competence with the goal of establishing freshman entrance requirements at some time in the future;

BE IT RESOLVED that, with respect to continuing undergraduate and transfer students, the university will require information competence certification to be fulfilled in one of the following manners:

All lower-division students will be required to take at least one course approved for Information Competence credit by the Information Competence Committee or will be certified as Information Competent in a manner approved by the Information Competence Committee before they begin their junior year or within two quarters of matriculation as upper-division transfer students. Transfer students may receive credit for meeting Cal Poly information competence requirements by completing work at other institutions.

Academic departments and programs may require their students to take courses in their major which meet the information competence criteria or recommend courses offered by other departments for this purpose. All such courses or sequences of courses must be approved for information competence credit by the Information Competence Committee. Courses approved for certification may include or involve on-line modules like those being developed by the Cal Poly Library.

BE IT RESOLVED that, with respect to graduating students, the university will require information competence certification to be fulfilled in the following manner:

The information competence committee will work with individual departments to enumerate appropriate graduation skills to ensure that their graduates are conversant with the information competency requirements of their fields and their professions. These mutually agreed upon standards will become part of the curriculum responsibility of each major.

Students must develop the ability to find, evaluate, use, synthesize, and communicate information as part of their academic program at Cal Poly in preparation for lifelong learning. They must be able to demonstrate these skills in an integrated process using both traditional and new technologies. More specifically, students must be able to:

1. State a research question, problem, or issue.

2. Determine the information requirements for a research question, problem, or issue and formulate a search strategy that will use a variety of resources.

3. Evaluate, select, and use the appropriate traditional and new technologies to
   - locate and retrieve relevant information in various formats,
   - organize and store information,
   - analyze and evaluate information,
   - synthesize information.

4. Create and communicate information effectively using a variety of information technologies.

5. Understand the ethical, legal, and sociopolitical issues surrounding information and information technology.

6. Understand the techniques, points of view, and practices employed in the presentation of information received from various media.

7. Understand, evaluate, and use relevant information received from various media.
A RESOLUTION FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A 
RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE AT CAL POLY

Background Statement: In 1996, the Academic Senate reconfigured its subcommittees. From this process, the Research and Professional Development Committee was formed and given the charge to assist in the development of research policies for the campus. Faculty on this Senate subcommittee, over the past two years, began identifying barriers to research on campus through a campus-wide survey and have prepared recommendations for creating an environment which supports faculty efforts in their scholarly work.

WHEREAS: Cal Poly is an institution known for its high quality of undergraduate education where graduate programs have traditionally played a small role and faculty teaching of undergraduates has been the highest priority; and

WHEREAS: The Cal Poly Strategic Plan outlines a greater emphasis on research activities by faculty in the future; and

WHEREAS: The Research and Professional Development Committee was formed by the Academic Senate and given the charge to assist in the development of research policies for the campus;

WHEREAS: The success of research on campus requires an investment of time by faculty and students, allocation of space, and commitment of fiscal resources by the university administration; and

WHEREAS: The process of discovery through research and creative activities is crucial for the continued growth and development of a community of faculty and student scholars; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That research and other creative activities be a significant factor in assigning teaching loads so that faculty who have viable research projects or other creative activities are able to develop their work;

RESOLVED: That department facilities, allocations, and budgets include consideration of research as well as teaching activities;

RESOLVED: That supervising of senior projects and graduate student thesis be given credit towards faculty teaching loads that are commensurate with investment

RESOLVED: That research program and proposal development efforts be supported;

RESOLVED: That graduate curricula be encouraged and fully developed, including funding for recruitment of graduate students and for graduate assistants;

RESOLVED: That scholarly activities (among other criteria) be given consistent recognition in retention, tenure, and promotion decisions at all levels of review.
Cal Poly Mission Statement

As a predominantly undergraduate, comprehensive, polytechnic university serving California, the mission of Cal Poly is to discover, integrate, articulate, and apply knowledge. This it does by emphasizing teaching; engaging in research; participating in the various communities, local, state, national, and international, with which it pursues common interests; and where appropriate, providing students with the unique experience of direct involvement with the actual challenges of their disciplines, in the United States and abroad.

Academic Programs.

The purpose of academic programs at Cal Poly is to fulfill the university mission of pursuing and transmitting skill, knowledge, and truth.

The research process involves keen observation, hypothesis development, measurements, analysis of data, and the determination of conclusions. This process is an essential component of the skill required of professionals entering the employment market.

Recently, Ernest Boyer in the academic bestseller, Scholarship Reconsidered, emphasized that teaching and research are two sides of the same coin, that each should be thought of as equally important scholarly activities of the professoriate. In his treatise, Boyer combines teaching, research, and service under one heading: scholarship.

Here at Cal Poly we are seeking ways to acknowledge “integrated scholarship,” at the same time acknowledging that what have been traditionally distinguished as research, scholarship and teaching are so closely interwoven as to be part of the same fabric.

For effective teaching without inquiry is the tree without the roots, an automobile without an engine. Like the tree’s roots, discovery, integration, and application nurture teaching — like the engine, research drives the disciplines forward to keep teaching relevant and alive. It is our challenge to be current in our discipline and to integrate most effectively the teaching and creative activity sides of our coin of the realm — for the sake of future generations of students, our faculty, and for the sake of society.

Having undergraduates engage in sustained work on demanding, multifaceted problems in which they learn to define and communicate their own solutions may be the best way to prepare our students for future challenges in their professions and communities. It is essential that our students learn the art of critical thinking and analysis and to work well in team efforts under the tutelage and mentoring of the faculty.

This commitment to undergraduate research, however, carries implications. It is, for one, demanding of faculty time. More positively, the trend renders the distinction
between faculty research and teaching as less significant, just as it breaks down barriers between faculty members and undergraduates.

The findings in the NSF report, called *Shaping the Future: New Expectations for Undergraduate Education in Science, Mathematics, Engineering and Technology*, clearly indicate that undergraduate research is of prime importance in the educational experience of young men and women. Similarly, *Building Community* by Boyer, supports the need for creative scholarship. The nation’s goal for undergraduate education, it states, should be that: **All students have access to supportive, excellent undergraduate education in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology, and all students learn these subjects by direct experience with the method and process of inquiry.**

It is, therefore, essential for Cal Poly to encourage and support research activities in the campus since this is an integral part of its stated mission. It is be apparent that in order for Cal Poly to support academic excellence and maintain the high standards of undergraduate education that society requires, it should support the research activities of its faculty. A recent survey conducted by this committee of the Cal Poly faculty revealed that although there is some level of support for the research activities of its faculty, Cal Poly does not provide the necessary support to meet the professional development needs of faculty and that of its students in the area of research.

The following areas were identified in a faculty survey as barriers to professional development by the faculty surveyed:

1. Unavailability of funds to maintain a professional development program;
2. Lack of policy for research/creative activity space allocation;
3. Inequitable teaching loads;
4. Unavailability of “seed” funds to develop or expand creative/investigative activities;
5. Lack of support for graduate courses and programs;
6. Lack of standardized RPT criteria and acknowledgment of research as a valued activity
7. Unavailability of functional, “supportive” intellectual environment
8. Ambiguous policy regarding intellectual property of inventors.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

*Make available funds to maintain a professional development program.*

Each department shall be allocated by the Dean or Vice President for Academic Affairs an additional 10% of the allocated FTE for release time to support faculty creative/investigative activities consistent with the professional development of both new and senior faculty. It is recommended that a committee be established to allocate such resources based on progress and productivity of the faculty member.
Provide space for creative/investigative activities.

Each college shall set aside space for creative/investigative activities and develop criteria for allocating such space to its faculty and students.

Equitable teaching loads.

A. Many universities in the US with comparable mission and goals to those of Cal Poly award release time of 1-2 courses per quarter to those faculty members engaged in research activities. It is recommended that release time equivalent to 1-2 courses per quarter be awarded to faculty members engaged in research activities and that this release time be proportional and equitable to the faculty’s time investment in the research activity.

B. Every effort shall be made by Department schedulers to insure that no faculty member has more than two different course preparations in a given quarter.

Make available for creative/investigative “seed” funds.

A research fund shall be made available from unencumbered overhead funds. Fund allocations shall be made available to all new faculty and the amount of the allocation shall be consistent with the needs of the discipline. These funds shall be made available as a shared effort between the University and the Foundation and shall be administered by the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies. New faculty shall be allocated 0.33 FTE release time for 3 academic years. Allocations for the release time shall be made available at the time new faculty positions are allocated to the colleges by the VP Academic Affairs.

Promoting graduate curricula

A. The recommendations of the Task Force on Graduate Education (Appendix A) shall be implemented as a means of supporting and enhancing graduate education and research at Cal Poly.

B. As graduate level courses require a greater in-depth coverage of the subject matter and a greater student-teacher interaction, that they should be given an additional weight factor when calculating WTU. Each one-hour, graduate level lecture be assigned 1.2 WTUs and each one-hour, graduate level laboratory be assigned 1.0 WTU.

C. Every effort shall be made to promote the professional development activities of Institutes and Centers.

D. Establishment of a University-wide seminar series to promote collegiality and enhance the intellectual environment in the Campus.
Resolution: Creation of a Permanent Director of a Faculty Development Center 
from Faculty Affairs Committee, 3/12/1998 

WHEREAS The importance of faculty development has been recognized in many Cal Poly and 
CSU documents; and 

WHEREAS The position of Director of a Faculty Development Center exists at other 
universities nationwide and within the CSU; and 

WHEREAS The Cal Poly Strategic Plan, “Road to the 21st Century”, page 6, recognizes 
that a director of faculty development is of importance; and 

WHEREAS The importance of development and training is recognized as an important factor to 
increase employee productivity in human resource studies; and 

WHEREAS The importance of teaching and professional development are recognized in 
promotion and tenure decisions in the University; and 

WHEREAS The efficiency of coordinating faculty development would be enhanced by 
centralizing the responsibility in one office; and 

WHEREAS The importance of having a single individual provide vision, leadership and 
accountability for the delivery of a comprehensive faculty development program 
is administratively apparent; and 

WHEREAS The importance of having a single individual monitor existing fiscal resources 
and create new revenue sources related to faculty development is administratively 
apparent; and 

WHEREAS The importance of having a single individual coordinate and collaborate with 
necessary internal and external units to assist in faculty development is 
administratively apparent; and 

WHEREAS The importance of adequate and unified representation of both internal and external 
constituencies to the CSU system related to faculty development topics is 
administratively apparent; therefore be it 

RESOLVED That the President create a Faculty Development Center and hire a director to 
provide vision, leadership and delivery of a comprehensive program in support and 
recognition to the career-long development of faculty in teaching, learning, 
technology and other related faculty development activities.
Resolution: Faculty Input for Academic Administrator selection from Faculty Affairs Committee, 3/11/1998

WHEREAS, There is an effort to improve collegiality at the university; and

WHEREAS, Faculty members are currently a part of search committees for academic administrators; and

WHEREAS, Potential confusion or uncertainty may exist if the search committee does not draft the job description; and

WHEREAS, Significant concern by the search committee if the job description is drafted by another group or person is not the proper atmosphere to begin a search for candidates; and

WHEREAS, Being a part of the process from the very beginning increases the "ownership" of any decisions made; and

WHEREAS, There would be consultation with the appointing administrative officer; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Job Description for Administrative Positions with academic responsibilities to the Provost and Academic Vice President be written by the designated search committee with appropriate faculty representation; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate Executive Committee be empowered to select faculty representatives to both assist in the writing of the job description and serve as members of the administrative position search committee
Resolution: Difference-in-Pay Leaves from Faculty Affairs Committee, 3/12/1998

WHEREAS, Difference-in-Pay Leaves requests are made annually by faculty; and

WHEREAS, There are often multiple Difference-in-Pay Leave requests by faculty each year in a College; and

WHEREAS, Often there are insufficient funds for these requests and ranking of requests must take place; and

WHEREAS, The importance of faculty consultation exists in the University; and

WHEREAS, At least one college in the university has established a college Difference-in-Pay Leave Committee; and

WHEREAS, That No university-wide policy exists concerning the establishment of college-equivalent Difference-in-Pay Leave Committee; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That a college-equivalent Difference-In Pay Leaves Committee composed of tenured faculty unit employees be established to review annual Difference-In-Leave requests and to make recommendations; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the college-equivalent Difference-In Pay Committee be composed of duly elected representative of each the departments or equivalent units in the college; and be it further

RESOLVED, The recommendations ensuing from such a review shall be submitted to Dean/Director; and be it further

RESOLVED, That appropriate university document(s) be altered to reflect this resolution.
Resolution: Dean Evaluation Form from Faculty Affairs Committee, 3/12/1998

WHEREAS, The office of Academic Dean has an important influence on University faculty; and

WHEREAS, A major portion of an Academic Dean's responsibilities involve faculty matters; and

WHEREAS, The existing evaluation form used to evaluate an Academic Dean is often not completed by specific college faculty; and

WHEREAS, The information provided to the Provost through the existing evaluation instrument for Academic Deans is viewed by the Provost to be minimally useful; and

WHEREAS, The administrative side of the evaluation of the Academic Dean involves goals and objectives that often take more than one year to evaluate; and

RESOLVED, That the attached form be utilized to Evaluate the Departmental Equivalent Faculty's Perception of Academic Deans; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this evaluation take place minimally every two years; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the evaluation be done in a spirit of improvement of the performance of the Academic Dean.
Departmental Faculty Evaluation of the Academic Dean

Instructions
Please take the time to evaluate your academic dean based on the following six topics. In your narrative, please indicate the strengths/weaknesses for each of the topics.

This should be a department faculty document. Tenure track faculty will formally approve the final evaluation document with input from non-tenure track faculty expected. If it is perceived that your knowledge of a topic concerning your dean is insufficient to address the topic, please indicate so in the evaluation. The department may produce the evaluation document as a subcommittee or as a committee of the whole. The specific procedure is to be decided by the department. Majority and minority reports from the departmental faculty are permitted. Efforts should be made to achieve a consensus departmental evaluation document. The person whom the departmental faculty is evaluating should be clearly noted. The department and those faculty concurring should also be noted on the document and forwarded to the Provost. Individual faculty members will remain anonymous when information is shared with the academic dean. The six topics of evaluation are:

1. Faculty development
   - Demonstrates a personal interest in the recruitment of the best faculty possible
   - Undertakes personal efforts to retain and develop professionally the faculty of the department

2. Promotion of the college
   - Has positive relations with alumni, parents, advisory councils, gift prospects, foundations, leaders, legislators, et al.
   - Articulates well the college’s "story" and generates interest and enthusiasm for others (industry/corporations) to join and help the vision to happen.
   - Ascertains that the college story is consistent and compatible with the distinct mission of the University.

3. Management of resources
   - Establishes and articulates clearly the priorities of the college
   - Assesses fairly and clearly the strengths and weaknesses within the college.
Clearly and consistently communicates the criteria for evaluating program viability.
Clearly and consistently communicates how college resources are managed and allocated and, particularly how his/her management facilitates strengths or improves weaknesses.
Seeks out new resources for the college.

4. Personal/professional status
• Knowledgeable of issues affecting the college within and without the University.
• Knowledgeable of the larger contexts affecting university planning.
• Standing in his/her professional area of expertise.
• Undertakes specific efforts to be active in his/her area of professional expertise.

5. University participant
• Recognizes the importance of the college as part of the university and is a team-player in this regard.
• Visible participant in university functions.
• Supports fellow deans and seeks cooperative relations among colleges.
• Supportive of University-wide leaders and directions/initiatives.

• Inspires trust.
• Acts fairly.
• Communicates effectively.
• Handle adversity calmly and effectively.
• Makes tough decisions.
• Open and handles suggestions/criticism well.
• Seeks input and listens well.
• Takes seriously evaluations of him/herself.
• Strives to make the University better.

For each of the six topics described above, please provide a narrative of strengths/weaknesses with suggestions for improvement. Also indicate those topics where lack of information is present.

Use the following scale for and overall evaluation for each topic:
0=unacceptable, 1=low, 2=average,3=above average, 4=high, 5=exceptional; N not knowledgeable of.
This information will be used by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs along with the agreed upon goals of the dean in the final evaluation process. Thus, you are contributing significantly to one half of your dean's evaluation. In your efforts to evaluate your dean, please remember that the purpose of this process is to improve the performance of the dean.
RESOLUTION ON STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCESS

Background

The Fairness Board of the Academic Senate deals with grade appeals concerning student grievances involving faculty. In addition, the campus currently has policies dealing with sexual harassment, amorous relations, and disputes involving students with disabilities. All other student grievances involving faculty that are not resolved informally are dealt with through the Office of Campus Student Relations and Judicial Affairs. These grievances are not involving grade appeals are at least as common as those grievances that do involve grade appeals. As a result, it would not be possible for the Fairness Board to deal with both types of grievances. The creation of a board to deal with these non-grade appeals would enable the Office of Student Relations and Judicial affairs to concentrate on providing advice, mediation, and conciliation services. Many other universities have similar student grievance procedures. In fact, the student grievance processes at other universities influence the enclosed process.

WHEREAS, The Fairness Board of the Academic Senate deals with grade appeals; and
WHEREAS, There are a number of student grievances concerning faculty that do not involve grade appeals and are not covered by existing policies; and
WHEREAS, These student grievances concerning faculty that do not involve grade appeals and are not covered by existing policies are currently dealt with through the Office of Student Relations and Judicial Affairs; and
WHEREAS, There is a need to create a process involving faculty and students to deal with these student grievances concerning faculty that do not involve grade appeals and are not covered by existing policies; therefore, be it
RESOLVED: That a Student Grievance Process be established consistent with the enclosed document; and, be it further
RESOLVED: That a Grievance Board be established consistent with the enclosed document; and, be it further
RESOLVED: That the Grievance Board is charged with creating procedures to implement a Student Grievance Process consistent with the enclosed document.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Ethics Task Force
Date:________
Student Grievance Process

1. **Scope:** The Student Grievance Process applies to student grievances involving faculty members that do not involve grade appeals and are not covered by existing policies. Grievances involving grade appeals should be submitted to the Fairness Board of the Academic Senate. For the purpose of this policy, faculty shall include part-time faculty as well as teaching assistants. The following matters do not constitute the basis of a grievance under this policy:
   
a. Policies, regulations, decisions, resolutions, directives, and other acts of the Board of Trustees and the Office of the Chancellor;
   
b. Any statute, regulations, directive, or order of any department or agency of the United States or State of California;
   
c. Any matter outside the control of Cal Poly;
   
d. Course offerings;
   
e. The staffing and structure of any academic department or unit;
   
f. The fiscal management and allocation of resources by the CSU and Cal Poly;
   
g. Any issue(s) or act(s) which does (do) not affect the complaining party directly.

2. **Informal Resolution Process:** A student should attempt to resolve the matter with the individual faculty member. If unable to reach a resolution, the student and faculty member may request assistance from the faculty member's department chair. There is no requirement that a complainant utilize this informal process before filing a formal complaint. The Office of Campus Student Relations and Judicial Affairs is available to provide advisory, mediation, and conciliation services to students raising such complaints.

3. **Formal Process:** To initiate the formal resolution process, a written complaint must be filed with the Office of Campus Student Relations and Judicial Affairs within two quarters of the time the complainant could reasonably be expected to have knowledge of the injury allegedly caused by the discriminatory action. If special circumstances exist, such as when a faculty member is on leave and not readily available to the student, the Grievance Board may elect to waive the two-quarter requirement. Complaints must include the following information:
   
a. The complainant's name, address, and phone number;
   
b. The specific act(s), or circumstances 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, if any (the grievant may choose to file a complaint for historical reasons).
4. **Grievance Board**: The Grievance Board shall include one tenured faculty member from each college and the Professional Consultative Services appointed by the Academic Senate for two-year terms, and two student members appointed by the ASI. The student members shall serve one-year terms and shall have at least junior standing and three consecutive quarters of attendance at Cal Poly preceding appointment. The Grievance Board chair shall be elected by the members of the Board.

   a. The Grievance Board shall be a committee of the Academic Senate.

   b. A quorum shall consist of six members (2/3) of the Grievance Board.

   c. Grievance Board members will disqualify themselves from participation in any case in which they are a principal or they feel that they cannot be impartial.

   d. The Grievance Board shall conduct hearings as appropriate and forward its recommendations to the Provost, to each principal party, and to the faculty member’s department chair and dean.

   e. Each principal party shall have the right to appeal the decision of the Grievance Board to the Provost.

   f. The Provost shall inform the Grievance Board, each principal party, and the faculty member’s department chair and dean of the action, if any, that has been taken.

   g. The Grievance Board shall provide a yearly report of its activities to the Provost with copies to the Director of Judicial Affairs and to the Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Undergraduate Education.

   h. The Director of Judicial Affairs shall be responsible for providing appropriate training for the Grievance Board.

   i. The Grievance Board shall ensure that confidentiality is maintained.
Resolution on Faculty Dispute Process

Background

Faculty members have agreed to be civil in their interaction with other faculty as noted in the Cal Poly Faculty Handbook based on the Association of University Professor's Code of Ethics. At the present time there is no process to mediate such disputes of civility. Civility matters have adversely affected departmental functioning, personnel decisions, improper labeling of colleagues, E-mail dialog and the copying of remarks, grant application awards, and others.

Whereas University faculty have agreed to act in a collegial manner to one another; and

Whereas There have been a number of faculty disputes where the process is perceived as either absent or may be viewed by faculty as either unfair, unacceptable or ineffective; therefore, be it

Resolved: That a Faculty Dispute Process be established consistent with the enclosed document; and, be it further

Resolved: That the Faculty Ethics Committee be established consistent with the enclosed document; and, be it further

Resolved: That the Faculty Ethics Committee be charged with creating procedures to implement a Faculty Dispute Process consistent with the enclosed document.
FACULTY DISPUTE PROCESS

FACULTY CONDUCT

California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo expects high ethical standards of all faculty. In particular, the university endorses the principles set forth in the following Statement on Professional Ethics by the American Association of University Professors (April, 1966)

Introduction

From its inception, the American Association of University Professors has recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. The Association has consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to the professor in his utterances as a citizen, in the exercise of his responsibilities to students, and his conduct when undertaking research. The Statement on Professional Ethics that follows, necessarily presented in terms of the ideal, sets forth those general standards that serve as a reminder of the variety of obligations assumed by all members of the profession.

In the enforcement of ethical standards, the academic profession differs from those of law and medicine, whose associations act to assure the integrity of members engaged in private practice. In the academic profession the individual institution of higher learning provide this assurance and so should normally handle question concerning propriety of conduct within its own framework by reference to a faculty group.

Civility between faculty members is a matter of faculty responsibility.

The Statement

1. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise
critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

2. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for the student as an individual and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guide and counselor. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

3. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

4. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

5. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as a private persons they avoid creating the
impression that they speak or act for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo's Academic Senate shall create a Faculty Ethics Committee. The purpose of this committee is to investigate and resolve disputes brought by members of the University faculty against colleagues. The Ethics Committee shall consist of 7 tenured persons appointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for a two year representing each of the colleges and the Professional Consultative Services. The Faculty Ethics Committee chair shall be elected by members of the Committee. 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 and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

**Authority of Faculty Ethics Committee**

1. **Investigation and Resolution of Disputes**

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. The Faculty Ethics Committee shall have to authority to determine whether the dispute should be resolved by a formal hearing. The Committee may, at its discretion, mediate disputes in cases where the mediation appears likely to provide a resolution or to refer to appropriate dispute resolution resources available in the University(e.g. Employee Assistance Program).

2. **Jurisdiction**

A. **Matters Within the Faculty Ethic Committee's Jurisdiction**

1. Violations of AAUP Code of Conduct
2. Enforcement by the University of regulations or statutes governing the conduct of faculty members not overseen by other jurisdictions.
(3) Other disputes that may arise between faculty members that seriously impairs faculty members' ability to function effectively as a member(s) of the University.

B. Matters Excluded from the Faculty Ethics Committee's Jurisdiction

(1) Disputes in which the relief requested is beyond the power of the University to grant
(2) Disputes being considered by another dispute resolution entity or procedure within the University (e.g. sexual harassment, amorous relationships, etc.)
(3) Disputes being heard or litigated before agencies or courts outside the University.

The University shall provide training appropriate to the authority of the Faculty Ethics Committee.

Conduct of Faculty Ethics Committee Investigations

1. Request for Investigation

Disputes between faculty members are encouraged to be resolved between the parties wherever possible. Assistance to mediate the dispute is encouraged. Where personal resolution is found to be unsuccessful and consultation with the department chair has not resolved the matter, a request for investigation may proceed. There is not requirement that a complainant utilize this informal process before filing a formal complaint.

Investigations by the Faculty Ethics Committee shall be initiated by the submission of a written complaint to the Chair of the Committee. The complaint must contain:

(i) a concise statement of the conduct complained of;
(ii) the person or persons involved;
(iii) the relief requested;
(iv) the efforts already made by the complaining party to resolve the dispute;
(v) and an affirmation that the dispute is not pending in some other forum in or outside the University

Complaints may contain more than one claim of wrongful action and seek more than one form of relief. Claims should be preferably
presented one quarter after occurrence. The claim must be raised within 12 months of the perceived wrongful action. The complaint may not exceed 5 pages.

Along with the complaint, the complaining party may submit supporting or clarifying documentation. These may include written argument by, or on behalf, the complaining party and may mention earlier events alleged to be related to the claim(s). Such argument may not exceed 20 pages. The Committee also may request a complaining party to submit further documentation where doing so might be vital to the Committee's decision.

A quorum shall consist of five member of the Faculty Ethics Committee.

The Faculty Ethics Committee may reject complaints that do not meet its criteria, without prejudice to the complaining party's ability to correct the defects and submit a new complaint. The Committee also may reject complaints that are excessive, are too vague or disorganized to provide the basis for effective inquiry.

Should the committee decide the complaint does not fall within its jurisdiction, the Committee shall dismiss the complaint. If the complaint falls within the Committee's jurisdiction, the Committee shall notify the complaining party who then shall be required to send to the person or persons whose alleged conduct is the basis for the complaint (hereafter, the other side) a copy of all materials submitted earlier to the Committee.

2. Authority to Reject Insubstantial Complaints

After considering the complaint and accompanying materials, the Committee may reject the complaint if, in its judgment, the complaint is insubstantial or the dispute is not sufficiently related to the concerns of the academic community to justify further investigation. In making this determination, the Committee may take into account whether the complaining party has made baseless or insubstantial complaints in the past. The Committee also may reject complaints if, as evidenced by the complaint and accompanying documentation, the complaining party has not made adequate efforts to resolve the dispute prior to invoking these procedures.

3. Response to Request for Investigation
If the complaint is suitable for investigation, the Committee shall request and expect a written response from the other side. The response must meet the same standards specified for complaints: its position stated concisely in no more than 5 pages, with a limit of up to 20 pages of supporting or clarifying documentation. The Committee also may request the other side to submit further documentation where this might be vital to the Committee’s endeavors. The Committee may set reasonable time requirements for the submission of materials in response to a complaint. If no response is made, the Committee may take such inaction into consideration in its resolution of the dispute.

4. Scope and Conduct of the Investigation

Upon determining that a particular complaint is substantial and within its jurisdiction, the Committee shall investigate the complaint. The nature and means employed in pursuing the investigation, including the interviewing of relevant parties and gathering of relevant information, shall be at the discretion of the Committee but the investigation shall be as extensive as necessary to resolve the dispute fairly. The Committee may conduct its own interviews, request additional evidence from the parties, consult with individuals it considers potentially to be helpful, and review the written materials already before it. At any stage of the investigation, the Committee may exercise its ability and discretion to resolve the dispute through mediation and reconciliation between the parties or referred to appropriate dispute resolution resources available in the University.

5. Concluding the Investigation

The investigation shall be concluded when any of the following occur:

(a) the dispute is resolved with the consent of the parties;

(b) the Committee rejects the complaint for reasons;

(c) the Committee issues its report and recommendation to the Provost;

(d) the Committee determines that a formal hearing should be held.
In its report to the Provost, the Committee shall indicate in writing the results of its investigation, including its view of the merits of the claims(s) made in the complaint, the resolution of any factual disputes essential to the Committee’s conclusion, and the Committee’s judgment about what actions, if any, should be taken by the University. The report need be no more detailed than necessary to summarize the Committee’s findings.

Within 30 days after receipt of a report from the Committee, the Provost shall in writing either affirm or modify the report or refer it back to the committee with objections. The Provost’s response shall be delivered to the chair of the Committee and to the parties involved. Failure to act within the 30-day time period shall constitute an affirmation of the Committee’s decision.

If the report is referred back, the Committee shall reconsider the case and, taking into account the objections or suggestions of the Provost, the Committee shall resubmit the report, with any modifications, to the Provost, who may affirm, modify, or reject it. The Provost’s decision shall be final and conclusive, and the matter in question shall be deemed closed, unless either party requests an appeal to the President within 30 days after receipt of a written copy of the provost’s decision.

If at any point in its investigation the Committee determines that a formal hearing must be held, the dispute may proceed directly to the formal hearing. In such instances, the Committee shall prepare a brief report setting forth the reason(s) for moving directly to a formal hearing.

**Formal Hearings**

1. Disputes for which Formal Hearing are Appropriate

Formal hearings shall be held in the following categories of disputes: (a) disputes in which formal hearings are mandated by law, and (b) disputes in which the Committee determines that a hearing is appropriate because the issues are so serious and the facts so unclear that live testimony and quasi-judicial procedures are appropriate to resolve the dispute fairly. Formal hearings should be the exception, not the rule, in faculty dispute resolution. No formal hearing shall be held if the complaining party expresses the desire, in writing, not to have such a hearing.
2. Preliminary Procedures

A. Hearing Panel

There shall be a Hearing Panel consisting of the Faculty Ethics Committee. The Panel members shall have no conflict of interest with the dispute in question. Members will disqualify themselves from participation in any case in which they are a principal for they feel that they cannot be impartial. The Hearing Panel shall decide all cases properly brought before it under the procedure specified in this document.

B. Statement of Charges

After submission to the Committee, the complaining party shall, within 30 days, send a statement of Charges to: the other side; and the chair of the Committee. The Statement of Charges shall contain the following: (a) a statement, not to exceed 5 pages, of the charges or charges and the relief requested; (b) a copy of any supporting of clarifying documentation, not to exceed 20 pages (c) a copy of any further documentation that might be requested by the Hearing Panel; (d) an initial list of witnesses to be called, accompanied by a brief description of why their testimony would be relevant to the Panel (the names of additional witnesses to be communicated when they become know); (e) a copy of any pertinent University policies or procedures, state statutes, contractual agreements, or other documents upon which the complaining party relies; and (f) a formal invitation to the other side to attend the hearing. Both parties may be accompanied by counsel of their choice. If the complaining party does not submit materials previously listed within the 30-day time limit, the Hearing Panel may take such inaction into consideration in its resolution of the dispute.

C. Answer

Within 30 days of receipt of the Statement of Charges, the other side shall send an Answer to: the complaining party; the chair of the Faculty Ethics Committee. The answer shall respond to the claims made in the Statement of Charges. It may not exceed 5 pages in length, and any accompanying or clarifying documentation may not exceed 20 pages. The Answer also shall include an initial list of witnesses to be called, accompanied by a brief description of why
their testimony would be relevant to the Panel (the names of other witnesses to be communicated when they become known). The Hearing Panel may request the submission of further documentation from an answering party where the Panel believes this may be of assistance to it.

The Answer also may contain a challenge to the complaining party’s entitlement to a formal hearing, in which case the Hearing Panel will consider the decision to grant a formal hearing. In such a case the Hearing Panel shall indicate in writing its reasons for concluding that a hearing is not warranted. Reasons may include the insufficient importance of the dispute or the degree to which the dispute can be resolved fairly based on the paper submissions of the parties.

D. Procedure Where No Answer or Hearing Waived

The Committee shall expect an answer from the other side. If no answer is filed or the other side states that no hearing is desired, the Hearing Panel shall resolve the dispute as it deems fair, based on the information submitted by the complaining party and independent investigation the Hearing Panel chooses to conduct. In such a case the Hearing Panel shall prepare a written report of its findings. This report shall be submitted to the parties and to the Provost.

E. Time and Place of Hearing

Upon receipt of the Statement of Charges and the Answer, if the Hearing Panel concludes that a formal hearing should take place, the hearing Panel shall set a time and place for the hearing. The Time ordinarily should be at least 30 days after submission of the Answer, but there should be no unreasonable delay beyond that point.

3. Procedures for Formal Hearings

A. The hearing is to be in private.

B. The responsibility for producing evidence, and the ultimate burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the complaining party’s allegations are true and a remedy is warranted, rest on the complaining party. The Hearing Panel may prescribe the order in which evidence is presented, and the way in which arguments are made, in order to facilitate resolving the dispute. Both sides shall be permitted to introduce evidence and make
arguments to the Hearing Panel, but the Hearing Panel may place reasonable restrictions on the time allotted for questioning, or argument, or on the number of witnesses, in order to facilitate a fair and efficient resolution of the dispute. The Hearing Panel also may determine whether any evidence or argument offered is relevant to the dispute, and may exclude irrelevant evidence. The rules of evidence of law courts shall not be binding at the hearing, by may be consulted by the Hearing panel in its discretion.

C. The Hearing Panel may, if it so desires, proceed independently to secure the presentation of evidence at the hearing, and it may request the parties to produce evidence on specific issues the Panel deems significant. The Hearing panel also may call its own witnesses, if it chooses, and may question witnessed called by the parties.

D. Parties on either side may elect to have their positions and evidence presented in whole or in part by the legal counsel or they may elect to have legal counsel available to them only for consultation. The Hearing Panel shall facilitate full examination of the evidence, including the cross-examination of witnesses where appropriate.

E. A verbatim record of the proceedings shall be kept and a full transcript shall be made available to the Hearing Panel at its option. The cost of the reporter and the transcript shall be paid by the University. The complainant has a right to review the transcript.

F. The Hearing Panel, may, at its discretion, adjourn the hearing to permit the parties to obtain further evidence, or for other legitimate reasons.

G. The Hearing Panel may request written briefs from the parties, either before the hearing or upon its completion.

4. Decision of the Hearing Panel

After the conclusion of the hearing, the Hearing Panel shall consider the evidence and the written submissions of the parties. The Hearing Panel then shall prepare findings of fact and a decision regarding the merits of the dispute, and a recommendation of the action, if any, that should be taken by the Provost.
At the same time, a copy of this final report form the Committee also shall be provided to each of the parties.

5. Decision of the Provost

Within 30 business days after receipt of the report, the Provost shall, in writing, either affirm or modify the report or refer it back to the Committee with objections. The Provost’s response shall be provided to each of the parties and the Chair of the Committee. Failure to act within the 30-day time period shall constitute an affirmation of the Committee’s decision. If the report is referred back, the Committee shall reconsider the case and, taking into account the objections or suggestions of the Provost, the Committee then shall resubmit the report, with any modifications, to the Provost, who may affirm, modify, or reject it.

6. Decision of the President

The President will be the final appeal body. The President’s decision shall be final and conclusive. A copy of the President’s decision will be given to the parties and to the Chair of the Faculty Ethics Committee.
WHEREAS "information competence" is the ability to find, evaluate, use, and communicate information in all its various formats, representing the integration of library literacy, computer literacy, media literacy, technological literacy, and communication skills;

WHEREAS the Strategic Plan of the CSU Council of Library Directors identifies information competence as a critical skill for all students;

WHEREAS the Information Competence Committee has been charged by President Baker and the Academic Senate with recommending appropriate information competence skill levels for entering students, means for assuring mastery of information competence skills for continuing and graduating students, and methods of assessing information competence skill levels for all students;

WHEREAS the Information Competence Committee has been charged as well with encouraging each major to develop and forward a list of skills and knowledge relating to appropriate information competence skills for their students;

WHEREAS the new GE template contains no provision for directly ensuring information competence, but asserts that it is a responsibility of the university to ensure the information competence of all its students (See Academic Senate Resolution approving the new GE model AS-478-97, 03/17/97);

WHEREAS no standards have yet been set by the state concerning information competence skills of graduating high school students;

BE IT RESOLVED that, with respect to entering freshmen students, the Information Competence Committee will continue to study and report on their preparation in information competence with the goal of establishing freshman entrance requirements at some time in the future;

BE IT RESOLVED that, with respect to continuing undergraduate and transfer students, the university will require information competence certification to be fulfilled in one of the following manners:

All students will be required to take at least one course approved for Information Competence credit by the Information Competence Committee or will be certified as Information Competent in a manner approved by the Information Competence Committee. Transfer students may receive credit for meeting Cal Poly information competence requirements by completing work at other institutions.

Courses approved for information competence credit must be major, minor, support, or GE courses, and each department will be required to specify at least one course or sequence of courses by means of which its majors can be certified as having completed the information competence component. Each degree program is encouraged to integrate information competence components into its existing major or core courses.

Academic departments and programs may require their students to take courses in their major which meet the information competence criteria or recommend GE, minor, or support courses offered by other
departments for this purpose. All such courses or sequences of courses must be approved for information competence credit by the Information Competence Committee. Courses approved for certification may include or involve on-line modules like those being developed by the Cal Poly Library.

Students will be encouraged to complete information competence courses before beginning their upper division work, but the information competence requirement will be implemented as a graduation requirement.

BE IT RESOLVED that, with respect to graduating students,

The information competence committee will work with individual departments to enumerate appropriate graduation skills to ensure that their graduates are conversant with the information competency requirements of their fields and their professions. These mutually agreed upon standards will become part of the curriculum responsibility of each major.
MEMORANDUM

Date: 13 April 1998
To: Academic Senate
From: Information Competence Committee

Subject: Information Competence Resolution

We would like to offer some background concerning the resolution on Information Competence that we have placed before the Academic Senate.

Our committee has drafted this resolution in response to the charge from your body (AS Resolution 463-96, attached), which specified the creation of the Information Competence Committee and which resolved that “continuing college students be required to meet university level information competence skills.” As a result of this resolution, Dr. Baker appointed our committee on 17 November 1997. (His memo to the members of our committee along with our charge is attached.) In accordance with this directive from the president and with these instructions from the Academic Senate, we also consulted the new GE template—AS Resolution 478-97, “GE Education and Breadth Model” and “GE Education and Breadth Model for Engineering Programs”—both of which state in footnote #3 that “Information competency and technology should be an educational outcome of the university curriculum.”

Given that the GE Committee and its several subcommittees under John Harrington have been fleshing out the undergraduate General Education curriculum, we thought it prudent to consult with those bodies as well. We found in the articulation of the GE area guidelines (dated 2 December 1997) inadequate mention of research, library resources, responsible use of information, copyright, and presentation and dissemination of information. We drafted a memo to Dr. Harrington and the GE Committee, and in response, their group added a sentence in Area I of the GE Criteria, which states that a course approved for “Reasoning and Argumentative Writing” credit shall provide instruction and practice in “finding, evaluating, and incorporating research materials, as well as attributing and documenting them accurately.” The revision also contains a sentence in the “General Principles,” which reads “GE Courses should, where appropriate, include guidance in information retrieval, evaluation of information, and appropriate use and citation of information” (Criteria for GE, 6 February 1998, memo from Dr. John Harrington). Because our committee did not believe that these emendations to the GE package sufficiently addressed the issue of information competency, we proceeded with our resolution.

Our approach was to establish a means of ensuring information competence in our students without adding additional units or courses to the curriculum. We believe that most programs already have courses in place, which, perhaps in conjunction with other GE courses, will satisfy information competence guidelines. In this way, the student is not burdened with additional courses, and information competence is infused throughout the curriculum in the spirit set by the GE committee in its admonition that “GE Courses should, where appropriate, include guidance in information retrieval, evaluation of information, and appropriate use and citation of information.”

So, for example, a student from the College of Engineering might be certified as information competent by completing one of his/her major courses (such as CSC 118) along with the third course from the Area I: Communications section of the GE package. Clearly, completion of these two courses would
accomplish the goals specified in the guidelines we have included with our resolution.

We have included with our packet of materials a brief statement on information competence by the Information Competence Work Group, which was established by the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology of the Chancellor's office.
Background Statement: It is becoming increasingly apparent that information competence is a bedrock skill for all college students. This is the ability to find, evaluate, use, and communicate information in all of its various formats [Information Competence in the CSU, A Report submitted to the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology, December 1995].

WHEREAS, It is a primary responsibility to foster such information skills among the students at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, These skills should be mastered at levels appropriate to entering students, continuing students, and graduating students; and

WHEREAS, Such skills need to be integrated into all levels of instruction, both vertically and horizontally as regards the curriculum; and

WHEREAS, Such integration is beyond the purview of any single major or the General Education and Breadth program; therefore,

RESOLVED: That entering students be required to meet basic information competence skills, that continuing college students be required to meet university level information competence skills, and that graduating students be expected to meet advanced information competence skills related to their majors; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That a university-wide committee be formed to recommend appropriate skill levels and methods of assessing skill levels and assuring mastery of skills for entering students and continuing students; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the recommendations be forwarded to the Provost for Academic Affairs, the Academic Senate, and the General Education and Breadth Committee; and, be it further

Approved by President Baker on 9.12.96
RESOLVED: That the committee will encourage each major to develop and forward a list of skills and knowledge relating to the informational competence appropriate for their graduating students; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the membership should represent the key divisions at the university who are involved with information competence. All memberships are for three years, with staggered terms to be determined initially by drawing lots, and the chair shall be chosen annually by the committee; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the committee be appointed by the Provost for Academic Affairs on the basis of the following recommendations:
   1. one member from each college, nominated by the dean of the college in consultation with its Academic Senate caucus;
   2. one member from the Library, nominated by the Dean of Library Services in consultation with its Academic Senate caucus;
   3. one member from the University Center for Teacher Education nominated by the Director of the UCTE;
   4. one member from Information Technology Services, nominated by the Vice Provost for ITS; and
   5. a representative of the Provost for Academic Affairs designed by the Provost;

   and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the university-wide committee submit an annual report on the university’s status concerning the three levels of informational competence to the following:
   1. the Chair of the Academic Senate
   2. the Provost for Academic Affairs
   3. the deans of the individual colleges
   4. the Director for the University Center for Teacher Education
   5. the Dean of Library Services
   6. the Vice Provost for Information Technology Services

   and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the first charge of the committee be a review of the issue of computer literacy in the new terms of information competence.

Proposed by the Computer Literacy Subcommittee
April 23, 1996
Revised May 28, 1996
To: Appointees Listed Below

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Date: November 17, 1997

Copies: P. Zingg, President Academic Senate,

Subject: Appointment of the 1997-1998 Information Competence Committee, CAM 172.33

I am pleased to endorse the nominations forwarded in accordance with CAM 171.C and hereby appoint, or reappoint, the following individuals to membership on the Information Competence Committee for the period indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>REPLACING</th>
<th>NOMINATING AUTHORITY (OR OFFICE HELD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Clover</td>
<td>Ex officio</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>(Vice Provost Info Tech/CIO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm Pillsbury</td>
<td>1996-1999</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>+Dean, Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Borland</td>
<td>1996-1998#</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>+Dean, Architecture &amp; Env Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldon Li</td>
<td>1997-2000</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>+Dean, Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Connely</td>
<td>1996-1999</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>+Dean, Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred O'Toole</td>
<td>1996-1998#</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>+Dean, Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Lang</td>
<td>1997-2000</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>+Dean, Science and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Adalian</td>
<td>1996-1999</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>Dean, Library Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Chin</td>
<td>1996-1998#</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>Director, UCTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Smith</td>
<td>1997-2000</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>Provost &amp; VP, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Greenwald**</td>
<td>1996-1999</td>
<td>Glenn Irvin</td>
<td>Provost &amp; VP, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Fryer</td>
<td>1996-1998#</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>Chair, Vice President, Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Bowker</td>
<td>1996-1998#</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>Chair, Staff Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Lant*</td>
<td>1997-2000</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>Chair, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arash Behziz</td>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>Mattias Stephan</td>
<td>President, ASI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee members are reminded of the importance of communicating with their constituents on issues of interest. The effectiveness of standing committees is directly related to timely input from represented groups.

The above appointments are effective immediately and remain in effect until appointments are announced for 1998-1999. As outlined in CAM 171, each campuswide standing committee will be requested to submit an annual report to the President with a copy to the University Committee on Committees at the conclusion of the academic year. In addition, this committee will submit the report as outlined in the committee's function and membership. Attached is an outline of the Information Competence Committee's function and membership.

* Chair
** Completing term
# Initial term, subsequent term will be three years
+ Nominated by college dean after consultation with Academic Senate College caucus.
INFORMATION COMPETENCE COMMITTEE

Functions

Information competence is broadly defined as the ability to find, evaluate, use and communicate information in all of its various formats.

The committee shall recommend appropriate informational competence skill levels and methods of assessing skill levels and assuring mastery of skills for entering students and continuing students. All recommendations shall be forwarded to the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Academic Senate and the General Education and Breadth Committee.

The committee will encourage each major to develop and forward a list of skills and knowledge relating to the informational competence appropriate for their graduating students.

The committee will submit an annual report on the University's status concerning the three levels (entering, continuing and graduating students) of informational competence to the following:

Chair of Academic Senate
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Deans of each instructional college
Director of the University Center for Teacher Education
Dean of Library Services
Vice Provost of Information Technology/Chief Information Officer

Membership

The committee is appointed by the President and reports to the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. The Provost will appoint a committee chair each year from among the members of the committee.

- Vice Provost of Information Technology/Chief Information Officer or his/her designee
- One faculty member from each instructional college, nominated by the college dean after consultation with the respective Academic Senate College caucus
- One representative from the Library, nominated by the Dean of Library Services
- One representative from the University Center for Teacher Education, nominated by the Director, University Center for Teacher Education
- Two representatives from Academic Affairs, nominated by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs
- One representative from the Student Affairs Division, nominated by the Vice President for Student Affairs
- One representative of the Staff Council, nominated by the chair of the Staff Council
- One representative from the Academic Senate, nominated by the chair of the Academic Senate
- One ASI student representative, nominated by the ASI President

The term of office shall be three years, except for the ASI student representative, who shall serve a one-year term.

Meetings

Monthly during the academic year or on call of the chair.

September 1996
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached "Proposed Model of Unit Distribution for General Education and Breadth"; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached "Proposed Model of Unit Distribution for General Education and Breadth" and all approved alternative reports be forwarded to President Baker and Provost Zingg for approval and implementation.
ALTERNATIVE REPORT NO. 1

The proposed General Education and Breadth model...

AREA I: COMMUNICATION  
Communication in the English language, to include both oral communication and written communication, and in critical thinking, to include consideration of common fallacies in reasoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Composition 4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPC &amp; Crit Think 4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comp &amp; Crit Think 4 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AREA II: SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS  
Inquiry into the physical universe and its life forms, with some immediate participation in laboratory activity, and into mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning and their implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Math/Stat 4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life Science 4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Science 4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>area elective 4 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AREA III: ARTS AND HUMANITIES  
Study among the arts, literature, philosophy, and foreign languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Literature 4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy 4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts 4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>area elective 4 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AREA IV: SOCIAL, POLITICAL, AND ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS AND HUMAN LIFE DEVELOPMENT  
Study dealing with human social, political and economic institutions and their historical backgrounds and global context, and with human behavior as the product of integrated physiological and psychological entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Am Hist/Pol 4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics 4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psyc/Health/etc. 4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Sciences 4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>area elective 4 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TECHNOLOGY ELECTIVE  
Study of technology and how it influences today's world. Courses must have a math or science prerequisite and should be integrated and sequenced with courses in other areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Technology Elective 4 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GEB ELECTIVE  
For students majoring in science-based curricula, one additional course in arts and humanities (Area III). For students majoring in non-science based curricula, one additional course in science and mathematics (Area II).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GEB Elective 4 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 72 units

(1) At least 12 units must be upper division  
(2) All courses must have a writing component as appropriate  
(3) Information competency and technology should be an educational outcome of the university curriculum  
(4) The General Education Committee is to pursue development of interdisciplinary core courses spanning more than one category  
(5) U.S. Cultural Pluralism is to be infused appropriately throughout the program  
(6) Double counting courses with major or support requirements is acceptable  
(7) Global and international issues are to be integrated appropriately into the program, and  
(8) The model should be implemented flexibly and creatively.
The proposed General Education and Breadth model addresses the primary objectives to be accomplished by the faculty and the General Education Committee:

1. create a model to accommodate a 4-unit standard course
2. keep the total required units in the program at 72
3. fulfill the conditions of Executive Order 595
4. encourage flexibility

### AREA I: COMMUNICATION (12 units)

Communication in the English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC &amp; Crit Think</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp &amp; Crit Think</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

oral communication and written

thinking, to include consideration

of common fallacies in reasoning

### AREA II: SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS (28 units)

Inquiry into the physical universe

and its life forms, with some immediate

participation in laboratory activity,

and into mathematical concepts and

quantitative reasoning and their

implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math/Stat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AREA III: ARTS AND HUMANITIES (16 units)

Study among the arts, literature,

philosophy, and foreign languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area elective</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AREA IV: SOCIAL, POLITICAL, AND ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS

AND HUMAN LIFE DEVELOPMENT (16 units)

Study dealing with human social, political

and economic institutions and their

historical backgrounds and global context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am Hist/Pol</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psyc/Health/etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 72 units

---

(1) At least 12 units must be upper division (2) All courses must have a writing component as appropriate (3) Information competency and technology should be an educational outcome of the university curriculum (4) The General Education Committee is to pursue development of interdisciplinary core courses spanning more than one category (5) U.S. Cultural Pluralism is to be infused appropriately throughout the program (6) Double counting courses with major or support requirements is acceptable (7) Global and international issues are to be integrated appropriately into the program, and (8) The model should be implemented flexibly and creatively.
INFORMATION COMPETENCE

The following is the third report of the Information Competence Work Group to the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology.

A Brief History

The Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology (CLRIT) was charged with developing and recommending policy guidelines to the Chancellor which facilitate the effective uses of learning resources and instructional technology throughout the CSU. In January of 1993, under the umbrella of CLRIT, the Council of Library Directors (COLD), in desiring to create a plan which would take the CSU libraries well into the twenty-first century, began a strategic planning process. This resulted in Transforming CSU Libraries for the 21st Century: A Strategic Plan of the CSU Council of Library Directors.

One of the areas identified for needed action was information competence which is considered by librarians to be a critical skill for all students. The plan states that the CSU needs to "establish basic competence levels in the use of recorded knowledge and information and processes for assessment of student competence". CLRIT approved the strategic plan of the CSU libraries and identified the area of information competence as a high priority. Accordingly, CLRIT requested the Office of Academic Affairs to form a work group which would address the issue of information competence.

The Information Competence Work Group began its study in April, 1995. Literature was reviewed, experts consulted and a workshop occurred which included representatives from every campus. In December of 1995, the Information Competence Work Group provided a report to CLRIT called Information Competence in the CSU. The report outlined the charge to the work group, defined information competence, provided information about the importance of the subject, analyzed methods for implementing a program in information competence and discussed the issues, both cultural and academic, which would encourage or inhibit a program on information competence. Most importantly, the Information Competence Work Group made recommendations for future action and requested that the Information Competence Work Group be permitted to move forward with campus consultation and also be permitted to return in June, 1996 with a plan of action for the future.
Information Competence
Page 2

CLRIT accepted the report on Information Competence in the CSU and cleared the Information Competence Work Group to move forward on campus consultation and on returning with an action plan. Consultation has occurred with the CSU Academic Senate and also, through the Council of Library Directors, on every campus. The CSU Academic Senate and the campuses provided valuable consultation to us which we have taken into account in the future development of this program.

The Importance of Information Competence

The latter half of the twentieth century has rightly been called the Information Age. Never has so much information been available in our history. We have moved into an environment in which information competence is at the center. With nearly 2.7 billion documents published world-wide each year, with the magnitude and complexity of current scientific research, with the rapid development of technology which has given us access to information never known before, every student who wishes to be considered educated and who needs to make a successful career must have a mastery of information competence. No student should graduate from California State University without the ability to formulate a research question or problem, to determine its information requirements, to locate and retrieve the relevant information, to organize, analyze, evaluate, treat critically and synthesize the information and to communicate and present that information in a cohesive and logical fashion. Moreover, no student should graduate from California State University without understanding the ethical, legal and socio-political issues surrounding information. If our graduates are to make a contribution to a wider world and create a better society, they must understand information--its power, its uses and its abuses.

Our Strategy

The Information Competence Work Group believes that information competence will succeed as a priority for the CSU if awareness is consistently raised about the issues and importance of information competence and if information about the successes and problems of various programs is continually shared. Therefore, the Information Competence Work Group has taken a four-pronged approach to developing information competence in the CSU. The four elements are:
The encouragement of programs: This includes the development of courses or other programs and workshops which cover the wide variety of issues relating to information competence. All programs should have an assessment component.

The transfer of knowledge about information competence: This includes providing information on the successes and failures of various programs, new thinking on information competence, teaching the teachers programs and assessment.

The linkages between programs both within and beyond the CSU: This includes any multi-campus effort or collaboration between the CSU and other universities, schools or agencies.

The creation and provision of tools to assist with information competence: This includes the creation of workbooks, software, model lists or any other instructional tool to assist with the teaching and learning of information competence.

Achievements
Summer and Fall, 1996

University Community Awareness: The Information Competence Initiative in the CSU was the topic of speeches given by Lorie Roth at the California Library Association and by Sue Curzon at the California Academic and Research Libraries Association. Lorie Roth has also submitted a proposal to AAHE for a panel at the March conference. In addition the Information Competence Workgroup has agreed to co-host a regional conference on information competence at the invitation of Patricia Breivik, a national expert in information competence and the author of Information Literacy.

First Proposal: In the Summer of 96, we awarded the first grant to a multi-campus consortium led by Paul Adalian of San Luis Obispo and including Pomona, Monterey Bay, Fullerton, and Los Angeles.

This project is developing classroom multi-media presentations, collaborative in-class exercises, and self-paced WWW instructional modules and electronic workbook component. Discipline specific information competencies will be integrated also into a new 3 unit course on information competence.
New Proposals: In February, the Information Competence Work Group will be meeting with a group of campuses to discuss additional efforts in the development of information competence. These range from discipline specific courses to distance learning to outreach to high schools and community colleges.

Campuses Involved in Information Competence efforts (12 campus).

Model List of Information Competence Skills for K-14:

Northridge
San Marcos
Dominguez Hills

Information Competence Courses:

Sonoma
San Luis Obispo
Northridge

Discipline Specific Information Competence:

Pomona
Fullerton
San Luis Obispo

Freshman Orientation Courses that contain Information Competence courses:

Chico
Long Beach
Northridge

Faculty workbooks, computer tutorials, checklists and other tools:

San Francisco
San Luis Obispo
Fullerton
Los Angeles
Monterey Bay
Pomona

Revised: 1/97
Distance Learning Efforts:

Chico
San Marcos
Sonoma

Information Competence Clearinghouse:
San Luis Obispo

Conclusion

The Information Competence Work Group would like to thank the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology for their support. We look forward to the continued development of information competence in the CSU.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan C. Curzon, Chair
Betty Blackman
Donald J. Farish
Patricia Hart
Glenn W. Irvin
Kathleen Kaiser
Roberta Madison
Lorie Roth
Gordon Smith

Revised: 1/97
INFORMATION COMPETENCE
A SET OF CORE COMPETENCIES

In order to be able to find, evaluate, use, communicate and appreciate information in all its various formats, students must be able to demonstrate the following skills:

1. Formulate and state a research question, problem or issue not only within the conceptual framework of a discipline, but also in a manner in which others can readily understand and cooperatively engage in the search.

2. Determine the information requirements for a research question, problem or issue in order to formulate a search strategy that will use a variety of resources.

3. Locate and retrieve relevant information, in all its various formats, using, when appropriate, technological tools.

4. Organize information in a manner that permits analysis, evaluation, synthesis and understanding.

5. Create and communicate information effectively using various media.

6. Understand the ethical, legal and socio-political issues surrounding information.

7. Understand the techniques, points of view and practices employed in the presentation of information from all sources.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS--98/
RESOLUTION ON
INTEGRATED MODES OF INSTRUCTION

WHEREAS, Faculty have developed new and effective modes of integrated instruction, such as the studio/lab; and

WHEREAS, The campus and CSU administrations have supported new modes of instruction by providing funds and facilities; and

WHEREAS, Current system and campus policies regarding facility use, scheduling and faculty assigned time do not always accommodate these new modes of instruction, causing considerable difficulties for faculty and students; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse acknowledge the development of new instructional modes as intrinsic to the evolution of current curriculum and pedagogy of the University; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the University administration examine local campus policies for barriers to the implementation of new modes of instruction and make revisions as necessary; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Chair of the Academic Senate be charged with communicating this Resolution to the Statewide Academic Senate; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate shall request that the President communicate to the CSU administration the need to update system policies regarding facilities use, scheduling, and faculty assigned time in order to accommodate these new modes of instruction; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That Curriculum Committee course proposal paperwork be updated to reflect flexibility in modes of instruction.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
January 15, 1998
Revised February 12, 1998
Revised April 13, 1998