I. Minutes: Approval of the April 11, 1995 Academic Senate minutes (pp. 2-5).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
Resolutions approved by President Baker:

- AS-432-95/EE Resolution on Department Name Change for the EL/EE Dept
- AS-434-95/EX Resolution on Promoting Curricular Review
- AS-435-95 Resolution on Proposal for a University Honors Program

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President's Office:
C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office:
D. Statewide Senators:
E. CFA Campus President:
F. Staff Council Representative:
G. ASI Representatives:
H. Steve McShane: report on the activities of the Running Thunder Club

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
B. Resolution on Change of Grades: Freberg, chair of the Instruction Committee, second reading, (pp. 12-15 of your April 11 agenda and p. 6 in today's agenda).
C. Resolution on CAGR Land Use: Hannings, caucus chair for CAGR, second reading (pp. 16-24 of your April 11 agenda and pp. 7-8 of today's agenda).
D. Resolution to Approve Indirect Cost Distribution Policy: Krieger, chair of the Research Committee, first reading (pp. 9-13).
E. Resolution to Amend AB 93-1, Cal Poly Sexual Harassment Policy: Swartz/Terry, chairs of the Status of Women and Personnel Policies Committees, first reading (pp. 14-15).
F. Resolution to Approve Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program: Gowgani, chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee, first reading (pp. 16-21).
G. Resolution to Approve Procedures for External Review of Departments with No Accreditation Agency: Gowgani, chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee, first reading (pp. 22-25).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
-7-

- The concept of protecting prime land is something that all of us need to be concerned about.
- Handling traffic, noise, safety (crossing railroad), light and glare from the stadium and ball fields are issues that have not been considered.
- (Regarding the master plan) It's not clear how these dots (showing placement of facilities) have come to be. This is a very valuable piece of land. What of other potential uses?
- Other problems with the site include parking, utilities, increased yearly cost to support it as an athletic facility.
- It was agreed that the Athletic Director be asked to elaborate on why other sites that have been suggested are not adequate before the next meeting. It was suggested that the Athletic Director be invited to attend the next meeting.

VI: Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Submitted by

Sam Lutrin
Secretary, Academic Senate
V. Business Items:

A. Election of Academic Senate officers for the 1995-1996 term: MSPU to approve by acclamation the following officers for the coming year: Harvey Greenwald, Chair; John Hampsey, Vice Chair; and Sam Lutrin, Secretary.

B. Resolution on Change of Grades: MSP several amendments such that the resolution as amended read as follows (amendments in italics)

WHEREAS, The current policy for change of grades (AS 384-92), enacted by the Academic Senate in 1992, has met the goals of the original resolution in the vast majority of cases; and

WHEREAS, Small numbers of exceptions to this policy do occur which require administrative decisions; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That grade changes beyond the one year time limit will be recorded automatically when a documented administrative or university error has occurred; and the Office of Academic Records has received evidence supporting the exception; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That for changes of grade involving I or SP grades, if the change in grade is submitted after the first seven weeks of the next quarter but within two years, the signatures of the instructor, department head/chair, and the dean shall be sufficient to effect a change in grade provided that supporting evidence is included; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That a subcommittee of three faculty representatives to the Instruction Committee will meet quarterly to review all exceptional cases, such as those which exceed the limits of AS 384-92 or the resolved clause above, are not administrative or university error, are not clearly documented, or are otherwise appealed by a faculty member, department head and dean; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That a student may request, and a department may grant, reasonable extensions of time for completion of work in internships, practicums, and to classes linked to completion of senior projects and theses. Such agreements will be made in advance of the extension and shall specify a schedule for completion of work. Departments will submit appropriate documentation of this to the Registrar when requesting grade changes; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the faculty subcommittee will prepare a response regarding the case and prepare instruction to the Registrar.

MSP to table the motion. The maker of the motion stated that he did not include a specific date for bringing this resolution off the table because it was his intent that the Executive Committee consider how to handle this issue.

C. Resolution on CAGR Land Use (first reading): Dave Hannings reviewed documents which CAGR believe show that objections to the site selection for the stadium have been raised throughout the process of selecting land for that athletic facility. He also reviewed information outlining some of the specific courses which use the site in question. He then reviewed reasons that designating the proposed site is detrimental to the CAGR academic program. The proposed site is class I agriculture land. There are only 84 acres of this land on campus. Even though Cal Poly has a great deal of land, most is not nearly as useful to the instructional program.

Following are some additional points raised during the discussion:
I. Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:13 pm.

II. Minutes: The minutes of April 11 were approved as submitted.

III. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): Resolutions approved by President Baker:

- AS-432-95/ELEE Resolution on Department name Change for the EL/EE Department
- AS-434-95/EX Resolution on Promoting Curricular Review
- AS-435-95 Resolution on Proposal for a University Honors Program

Question: How will the Resolution on Promoting Curricular Review be handled? Vice President Koob responded that the administration made this policy clear to the deans a year ago. They again will be sending it to the Deans and the Senate also can forward its view to them.

IV. Reports:

A. Faculty representatives on the Charter Governance Committee: A draft model generated by the faculty representatives was distributed. The group is still in the process of coming up with a model.

B. Statewide Senators: Kersten: A dinner was held in honor of the recipients of the CSU outstanding professor, one of whom is Craig Russell. He is the second Cal Poly faculty member to receive this award in the last five years. Actions taken at the last meeting include the following: (1.) passage of a resolution to support a task force report on governance. The salient features include efforts to develop a more effective relationship between the statewide and the local senates; (2.) agreement to continue efforts to expand external relations activities (primarily with government officials); (3.) proposed modifications of the statewide Senate with special priority given to limiting the size of the statewide senate by keeping it essentially as it is now. Currently each time a new campus opens, senate positions are added. This proposed change will go to statewide referendum with voting on all campuses.

In regard to negotiations for a new contract, both the administration and the faculty union have put forward proposals for a merit pay structure different from the current one. It seems not unlikely that any contract will include a section. The law requires that the Senate set the criteria. The Cal Poly Academic Senate needs to be prepared for this. Changes could go into effect as early as next fall.

The Statewide Senate also opposed a bill in the legislature that proposes joint CSU and community college bachelor degrees, adopted a new work plan for next year, and elected new officers.

C. CFA Campus President (Paul Murphy for George Lewis): George Lewis is with a group which is demonstrating against the CSU merit pay structure proposal. The CFA is in favor of merit but is not prepared to go to a new salary schedule until there is an increase in money available. The union is advocating a 2% across the board increase based on the current salary schedule.

D. Staff Council: The Staff Council elections have taken place. Its diversity task force has developed a document entitled, "Affirmation to create a better environment for Cal Poly students" which will be available for faculty and staff to sign and post in or near their offices.

E. ASI: On May 10, there will be a referendum asking students to approve an increase in student fees to support the ASI Children's Center. New officers are busy making appointments. The Homecoming date has been set. The formal report was followed with a presentation about "Running Thunder," a student spirit group.
WHEREAS, The current policy for change of grades (AS 384-92), enacted by the Academic Senate in 1992, has met the goals of the original resolution in the vast majority of cases; and

WHEREAS, Small numbers of exceptions to this policy do occur which require administrative decisions; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Registrar, acting on behalf of the University and with the support of the Academic Senate, will record That grade changes beyond the one year time limit will be recorded automatically when a documented administrative or university error has occurred, and the Office of Academic Records has received evidence supporting the exception; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That a subcommittee of three faculty representatives to the Instruction Committee will meet quarterly with the Registrar to review those all exceptional cases, such as those which exceed the time limits of AS 384-92, are not administrative or university error, or are not clearly documented, or are otherwise appealed by a faculty member; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the faculty subcommittee will prepare a response regarding the case to be communicated to the college and department by the Registrar.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee
April 19, 1995
3. **Class Instructional Use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Visits per Year</th>
<th>Total Student Visits per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 123</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>E. Seim</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forage Crops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 131</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>L. Harper</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 221</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>J. Greil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 230</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>L. Harper</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agronomic Crop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 230</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>J. Phillips</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 304</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>E. Beyer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 311</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>J. Wheatley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insect Pest</td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Shelton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 411</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>J. Phillips</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 441</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>J. Wheatley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 445</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J. Phillips</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropping Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC X450</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E. Seim</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Alfalfa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 470</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>M. Güerena</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Topics:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>545</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,373</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-95/
RESOLUTION ON
CHANGE OF GRADES

WHEREAS, The current policy for change of grades (AS 384-92), enacted by the Academic Senate in 1992, has met the goals of the original resolution in the vast majority of cases; and

WHEREAS, Small numbers of exceptions to this policy do occur which require administrative decisions; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Registrar, noting on behalf of the University and with the support of the Academic Senate, will record that grade changes beyond the one year time limit will be recorded automatically when a documented administrative or university error has occurred, and the Office of Academic Records has received evidence supporting the exception; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That a subcommittee of three faculty representatives to the Instruction Committee will meet quarterly with the Registrar to review those all exceptional cases, such as those which exceed the time limits of AS 384-92, are not administrative or university error, or are not clearly documented, or are otherwise appealed by a faculty member; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the faculty subcommittee will prepare a response regarding the case to be communicated to the college and department by the Registrar.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
April 19, 1995
3. **Class Instructional Use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Visits per Year</th>
<th>Total Student Visits per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 123 Forage Crops</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>E. Seim</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 131 Introduction to Crop Science</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>L. Harper</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 221 Weed Science</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>J. Greil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 230 Agronomic Crop Production</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>L. Harper</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 230 Laboratory</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>J. Phillips</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 304 Plant Improvement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>E. Beyer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 311 Insect Pest Management</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>J. Wheatley M. Shelton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 411 Experimental Techniques and Analysis</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>J. Phillips</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 441 Biological Control of Insects</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>J. Wheatley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 445 Cropping Systems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J. Phillips</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC X450 Advanced Alfalfa Production</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E. Seim</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSC 470 Special Topics: IPM</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>M. Güereña</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>545</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,373</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Other Departments**

Animal Science Department: Rob Rutherford's sheep enterprise project has used the field for grazing and for his sheep production class exercises.

Agribusiness Department: Ken Scott uses the field for a class exercise for 38 students.

Biological Sciences Department: Mike Yoshimura, Kingston Leong and Alan Cooper regularly use this field for their plant pathology, entomology and nematology classes. The Biological Sciences Department is in the process of providing more detailed information about their use of this field.

Soil Science Department: Brent Hallock and all the other Soil Science professors who teach the lab use the field for soil science land use and soil survey classes, 240 students per year.

5. **Future Use**

- The field will be used this spring for a silage corn enterprise project and a senior project variety trial for the Pioneer Seed Co.

- Dr. John Phillips is doing a follow-up study along with this project to determine the optimum N rates for corn fertilization following legumes (alfalfa). Two special problems students are planning to work on this project during summer 1995.

- In Fall 1995 this field will be used by Dr. Robert McNeil for citrus and avocados. Once the field is established it will be used for enterprise projects. To establish this field, Dr. McNeil plans to offer special topics classes and involve students in this project as we have in our vineyard development classes. Dr. McNeil also plans to carry out the following research projects for which he has requested financial assistance from the Avocado Society. There will be six senior projects:
  1) low volume irrigation trial
  2) fertilizer injection trial
  3) insect biocontrol
  4) IPM experiment for citrus and avocados
  5) evaluation of ten different avocado rootstocks
  6) evaluation of several lemon varieties
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached Indirect Cost Distribution Policy; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached Indirect Cost Distribution Policy be forwarded to President Baker and Vice President Koob for approval and implementation.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Research Committee
Date: April 25, 1995
INDIRECT COST DISTRIBUTION POLICY

Whereas indirect costs recovered on grants and contracts are reimbursements by the sponsor to the University for real costs that the University has incurred;

and whereas the University is committed to furthering the development of faculty and student research, creative activity, and instructional support activities (e.g. fellowships, curriculum development, student services) on the campus;

the following indirect cost distribution policy is proposed:

1. A fixed percentage of the indirect costs (IDC) recovered on all grants and contracts will be returned to the project investigators and their administrative units (academic administrative units or research centers/institutes that have received senate approval). These funds will be restricted in their use as outlined subsequently in the policy.

2. To qualify for a return of IDC to either a project investigator or an administrative unit the grant or contract must have earned indirect cost income equal to 20% of the total direct costs, or the federally negotiated rate on a federal grant or contract in the event that this is less than 20% of total direct costs.

3. If a grant/contract qualifies for a return of IDC, 12.5% of the recovered indirect costs will be returned to the project investigator(s) and 12.5% to the administrative unit.

4. Distribution of the indirect cost returns computed as above will be made on a quarterly basis. Eighty percent of the 25% to be returned will be distributed at that time. The remainder will be held in reserve until the end of the fiscal year. Direct cost overruns on a project will be covered from the portion of indirect cost income remaining for distribution to that project. Should the overruns exceed the funds available, they will be covered from the indirect cost allocation due to the project in the next fiscal year, before any subsequent distributions are made. Amounts less than $100 for a fiscal year will not be distributed.

5. The remaining indirect costs will be pooled with those recovered on sponsored projects that did not qualify for a return of IDC, and used to support the Department of Sponsored Programs in the Foundation and the University Grants Development Office. Any funds remaining after the justifiable expenses of these two units have been met, will be transferred to the Dean for Research and Graduate Programs, to be used in support
of the development of research on the campus.

6. The amount transferred to Research and Graduate Programs will not exceed the total amount returned to project investigators and administrative units in a given fiscal year. Should this occur, additional amounts will be returned to the project investigators and administrative units in proportion to their IDC earnings, so that the total amount of IDC distributed to them is equal to the amount assigned to Research and Graduate Programs.

7. If insufficient funds remain after the distribution to project directors and administrative units to cover the legitimate expenses of the Grants Development and Sponsored Programs offices, the deficit will be covered from the General Fund of the University. Approval of this allocation will be the responsibility of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

8. All sponsored projects are expected to recover full indirect costs (for FY '93-'94, approximately 22% of total direct costs) from the sponsor. Project investigators will make every reasonable effort to assure this.

9. Funds that are returned to project investigators may be used for professional development activities and research expenses. They may not be used to pay additional salary of any kind to the project investigator. Examples of appropriate uses of these funds are:

   Professional travel
   Books, journals, office supplies
   Telephone, postage, photocopy, photographic expenses
   Secretarial services
   Student assistant expenses
   Dues for professional organizations
   Publication costs
   Additional released time

10. Funds that are returned to administrative units may be used for any appropriate purpose except to provide additional salary of any kind to project investigators.

11. Sharing of indirect cost returns among several investigators on a single project will be based on the percent effort devoted to the project by each investigator. Only principal and co-investigators will share in the return. The same parameter will be used to determine the sharing of indirect cost returns among administrative units on projects that involve more than one such unit.

12. The Academic Senate Research Committee will develop criteria to assess the impact of the provisions of this policy. The Committee will review the policy at the end of each fiscal year and make recommendations for changes, as appropriate, in a written report to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.
Impact of the Application of this Policy to the '93-'94 Fiscal Year (see attached table.)

If this policy had been applied in 1993-1994, 43 project investigators in six colleges, and 20 administrative units in six colleges, would have received returns of indirect cost income, ranging from $130 to $13,248 for individual project investigators (total: $75,291), and $130 to $30,297 for individual administrative units (total: $75,291). A total of $150,582 would have been returned to project investigators and administrative units. The operating expenses of the Sponsored Programs and Grants Development Offices would have been met fully and * $5,047 would have remained for the Office of Research and Graduate Programs.

* It should be noted that the Grants Development Office drew on reserves to cover part of their expenses. If CDO expenses had been fully covered, an additional $18,000 would have been used, resulting in a deficit of $12,953 rather than a surplus. The deficit would have had to be covered from University funds and no funds would have been transferred to the Research and Graduate Programs Office.
### Application of Proposed Indirect Cost Policy to FY 93/94

**DISTRIBUTION THRESHOLD, \# OF DOLLARS**

\$99.99

**PD RECOVERY THRESHOLD FOR DIST =**

19.99%

**THEN PERCENT TO PD =**

12.50% of IDC RECOVERED ON PROJECT

**DPT RECOVERY THRESHOLD =**

19.99%

**THEN PERCENT TO DPT =**

12.50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>DEP</th>
<th>DEPDISBOTH</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>PDDIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>CAVALETTO</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>ASIN</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>WILLIAMS</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>CRI</td>
<td>5,316</td>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>DAUGHERTY</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>DPTC</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>HUNT</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>DRSC</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>HALLOCK</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>ITSC</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>RICE</td>
<td>3,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>SOIL SCI</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>VILKITS</td>
<td>1,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARED</td>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>TONG</td>
<td>2,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARED</td>
<td>DESI</td>
<td>9,926</td>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>REIF</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>STYLES</td>
<td>1,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>AERO</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>DINGUS</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>ARDFA</td>
<td>30,297</td>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>RICE</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>CSCI</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>ARED</td>
<td>POHL</td>
<td>3,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>ELEE</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>ARED</td>
<td>POHL</td>
<td>8,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>2,364</td>
<td>ARED</td>
<td>RODGER</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBA</td>
<td>PSHD</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>GAY</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCMA</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>4,341</td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>CUMMINGS</td>
<td>1,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCMA</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>CHATZIIOANOU</td>
<td>3,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCMA</td>
<td>CTED</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>HOCKADAY</td>
<td>7,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCMA</td>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>7,436</td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>KOLKAILAH</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>MACCARLEY</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>MARTIN</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>SULLIVAN</td>
<td>11,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>VAN'T RIET</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>WALSH</td>
<td>6,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>FISHER</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>MACCARLEY</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>NAFISI</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>TANDON</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>CARPENTER</td>
<td>1,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>CHIVENS</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>MEDIZAHDEH</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIBA</td>
<td>LEVI</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIBA</td>
<td>VALENCIA-LAVER</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCMA</td>
<td>HANSON</td>
<td>3,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCMA</td>
<td>HOLLAND</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCMA</td>
<td>HOLLAND/HANSON</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCMA</td>
<td>CENSULLO</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCMA</td>
<td>JONES</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCMA</td>
<td>WILLS</td>
<td>1,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCMA</td>
<td>CICHOWSKI</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCMA</td>
<td>FRANKEL</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCMA</td>
<td>HOFFMAN</td>
<td>1,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCMA</td>
<td>KNIGHT</td>
<td>1,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCMA</td>
<td>ROSEN</td>
<td>2,635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total to Project Directors**

$75,291

**Total to Departments**

$75,291

**Distribution Total**

$150,582

[Note: The text contains a table with various entries, likely representing departmental distributions and individual names associated with each distribution amount.]
WHEREAS, Administrative Bulletin 93-1 (AB 93-1), the Cal Poly Sexual Harassment Policy, commits the University to creating and maintaining an environment in which faculty, staff, and students are free to work together in an atmosphere of mutual respect and unconstrained academic interchange, and

WHEREAS, AB 93-1 holds all Cal Poly faculty, staff, and administrators accountable for compliance with the University’s sexual harassment policy, and

WHEREAS, Sexual harassment seriously threatens the academic environment and violates state and federal law, as well as University policy, and

WHEREAS, AB 93-1 currently makes optional the placing of a statement of findings in an employee’s personnel file after a University determination that the employee has violated the University’s sexual harassment policy, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That AB 93-1 be amended such that any violation of AB 93-1 by any Cal Poly employee (as determined by University investigation of a formal complaint) shall result in a copy of the University’s findings, which will include information on both the offense and remedy (sanction) taken, being placed in the employee’s personnel file within five days of such a finding with any and all references to the personal identity of the complainant removed.
At your request, the Status of Women Committee has reviewed AB 93-1, the Sexual Harassment Policy. Specifically, you had inquired about whether the policy "... was violated by neglecting to make this charge [a finding of sexual harassment] a matter of consideration in the faculty member's tenure review."

As stated in the background section of AB 93-1 "California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, is committed to creating and maintaining an environment in which faculty, staff, and students work together in an atmosphere of mutual respect and unconstrained academic interchange." Furthermore, AB 93-1 goes on to state, "Sexual harassment is not simply inappropriate behavior...Sexual harassment violates University policy, seriously threatens the academic environment, and is contrary to law...All faculty, staff, and administrators will be held accountable for compliance with this policy..."

While sexual harassment has been identified as inappropriate, illegal and intolerable behavior at Cal Poly, there is no provision in AB 93-1 for a finding of sexual harassment to result in a letter placed in the individual's personnel file. Such action may be taken, but is not required. It is the conclusion of the committee that while the policy was not technically violated, the spirit of the policy was.

Given the University's position, as quoted above, it is not clear why such a requirement is missing. Based on our review of this matter, it is the recommendation of the Status of Women Committee that following changes occur:

- amend AB 93-1 such that "a finding of sexual harassment results in a letter placed in the individual's personnel file";
- amend Cal Poly's appointment, retention, promotion and tenure policy to incorporate, specifically, consideration of professional ethics, which would include among other things the issue of sexual harassment.
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program be forwarded to the President of Cal Poly for approval and implementation.
POLICY AND REVIEW PROCEDURES
FOR DISCONTINUANCE OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM

Many CSU campuses, including Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, may find it necessary to reduce faculty, support, and administrative positions due to enrollment declines or financial support reductions. When financial support is reduced, the discontinuance or curtailment of programs or departments sometimes emerges as the alternative which does the least harm to the quality of remaining programs. Program and department discontinuance or curtailment are valid ways of responding to reductions in resources; however, program discontinuance can and must be accomplished with minimal impact. Program discontinuance decisions must be made in a reasoned way which will minimize damage to institutions and to the majority of their programs.

The following procedures have been developed in response to Ep&R 79-10, January 26, 1979, Chancellor Dumke to Presidents, "Interim Policy for the Discontinuance of Academic Programs," and EP&R 80-45, June 12, 1980, Vice Chancellor Sheriffs to Presidents, "Clarification of Interim Policy for Discontinuance of Academic Programs." These documents outline general procedures for program discontinuance and request that campuses submit local discontinuance procedures.

I. PROCEDURES

A. Initiation of a discontinuance proposal.
A proposal to discontinue an academic program will ordinarily be the result of regular program review but a request for special review may be initiated at any time by any of the following:
- A majority of the tenured and tenure track faculty of the affected department(s)
- The dean of any of the schools involved in the program.
- The Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- The President of the University.
The proposal shall clearly indicate whether the proposed discontinuance is to be permanent or temporary. The proposal shall be submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for review.

B. Review of a discontinuance proposal.
The Vice President for Academic Affairs will review the proposal for discontinuance and accept or reject the proposal within three calendar weeks. If the request for review is approved, a Discontinuance Review Committee will be appointed within three calendar weeks after approval, to conduct a review in accordance with the procedures outlined in this document and make recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, as required by the CSU Chancellor's Office.

C. Appointment of a review committee.
The review committee will consist of two groups.
The first group will include:
1. A representative from the Academic Program office (nonvoting)
2. The Deans of schools not involved in the program (or a representative nominated by the Dean)
3. One student not involved in the program, nominated by the ASI President
4. Two faculty representatives from schools not involved in the program, nominated by the Chair of the Academic Senate

The second group will include:
1. The Deans of schools involved in the program (or a representative nominated by the Dean)
2. The department heads of departments involved in the program
3. One student involved in the program, nominated by the ASI President
4. Two faculty representatives involved in the program, nominated by the tenured and tenure track faculty involved in the program.

D. Recommendations from the committee.
The ultimate decision to discontinue a program rests with the Chancellor's office. The purpose of the Discontinuance Review Committee is to facilitate the recommendation of the President or Academic Vice President by providing an impartial report on the merits or lack of merit of the program under review. If there is no opposition to the proposed discontinuance within the committee, the proposal will be forwarded to the Academic Vice President, with a report indicating that there is no opposition. If any of the committee members oppose the discontinuance, the Discontinuance Review Committee will generate a report, using the following two step process.

In the first step, each group will create a document describing the strengths and weaknesses of the program under review, and a justification of why the program should or should not be terminated. The documents must be generated within sixteen weeks after the committee has been appointed. The merits of the program shall be assessed using the elements described in the Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines. If appropriate, the document shall include what remedies could be taken to address weaknesses, including a precise statement of goals and a time table to reach those goals.

The document shall then be made available to all faculty members for comments for four weeks. A written request for comments must be sent to all the faculty and staff directly affected by the potential discontinuance at the start of the period for comments.

In the second step, immediately following the four weeks of comments, the two groups will exchange documents and provide a critique of the arguments presented in the document from the other group within six weeks.

The two groups will then have four weeks to jointly discuss and amend the documents produced. The final version of the two analyses, with the comments from the other groups, and with all the information deemed relevant, shall be bound in a single document (which, at this point, should have a format similar to what is produced by the state analyst to assist voters) and sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Academic Deans Council and the Academic Senate for review and recommendation.

E. Final decision on discontinuance of the program.
The Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Academic Deans Council and the Academic Senate will forward their recommendations to the President within six weeks, and the president will make his final recommendation to the Chancellor's Office.
II. CONSIDERATIONS IN PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE REVIEW

Considerations for program discontinuance will be similar to those for initiation of new programs. The elements that must be considered in a final recommendation must also include, but will not be limited to:

- The impact of discontinuance on student demand
- The impact of discontinuance on Statewide or regional human resources needs
- The effectiveness of the program to meet the identified needs.
- The existence of programs within the CSU which could enroll students in this program.
- A three year history of the total cost per FTEF and per FTES for the program at Cal Poly and at other institutions offering comparable programs.
- The effects of enrollment shifts on other instructional areas at Cal Poly.
- The current or expected demand for graduates of the program.
- The contributions of the program to the general education and breadth of students.
- The effects of discontinuance on facilities:
  - The financial effects of discontinuance, including an estimate of the yearly savings for the three years following discontinuance.
  - The effects on faculty and staff, including a description of what career opportunities the University will offer them.

III. INFORMATION FOR PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE REVIEW

The information considered during the evaluation of an academic program for discontinuance will contain all the information that is needed for the creation of a new program. In addition, the information will include but will not be limited to:

A. The most recently completed Review of Existing Degree Programs with current statistical update.

B. The most recent accreditation report, if a program is accredited or approved. If the accreditation is over six years old, or if there is no accrediting body for the program, a review of the program by a panel of professionals outside the CSU can be substituted for the accreditation report, provided the review has been done within the last six years. The review shall contain all the elements included in an accreditation report.

C. If not contained in A or B:
   1. FTEF required each quarter for the past three years
   2. Special resources and facilities required
   3. Number of students expected to graduate in each of the next three years

D. Conclusions and recommendations of the project team on Academic Programs, contained in the 1980 edition of Academic Program and Resource Planning In the California State University and Colleges, p 28.
## TIME TABLE FOR PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proposal to discontinue an academic program received by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Academic Vice President accepts or rejects the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Discontinuance Review Committee appointed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Initial report: Each of the two groups from the program discontinuance committee produce their report and exchange it for the report from the other group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Period of comments: Each of the two groups from the program discontinuance committee solicit comments on the reports from the University at large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Critique of the initial reports: Each of the two groups from the program discontinuance committee produce a critique of the arguments produced by the other group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Final report: The two groups from the program discontinuance committee jointly discuss and amend, if necessary, the final document, and send it to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Academic Deans Council and the Academic Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Recommendations: The Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Academic Deans Council and the Academic Senate make a recommendation to the President.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** A calendar week is five working days. Calendar weeks exclude Summer break and the breaks between quarters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of the proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review by the Academic VP</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of the committee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First step of the review</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of comments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second step of the review</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final document drafted</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review by upper levels</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final comments to the President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total time</td>
<td>42 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached Procedures for External Review of Departments with no Accreditation Agency; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached Procedures for External Review of Departments with no Accreditation Agency be forwarded to the President of Cal Poly for approval and implementation.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee
Date: April 25, 1995
PROCEDURES FOR EXTERNAL REVIEW OF DEPARTMENTS WITH NO ACCREDITATION AGENCY

I. Review Cycle

It is the recommendation of the Long-Range Planning Committee that the external review cycle should occur every five years. It is for the benefit of the department that this review take place the year before the program comes up for review by the Academic Senate Program Review & Improvement Committee.

II. Composition of the Review Panel

A. The review panel will be composed of three persons: (1) academic representative (e.g., president of respective society, department head or faculty member from another institution; (2) industry or public agency representative (e.g., head of commodity group, company CEO, well-recognized grower); (3) a faculty member close to the discipline, preferably from another college (e.g., biological science faculty for the Crop Science program).

B. The department under review will propose the names of the review panel with the college dean's approval. If the name(s) is(are) not acceptable, more names will be submitted for consideration.

C. An academic member from another institution will serve as the chair of the panel.

D. It is recommended that the team members work together. However, it is possible that a review panel member may conduct an independent review. The findings are to be submitted as one report. The chair of the review panel will submit the official report.

III. Preparation for Review

A. Pre-visit preparations

1. In preparation for the review, the department will conduct its own self-evaluation by updating the following items:
   a. Faculty vitae--detailing recent five-year activities, professional development, consulting, publications, new course offerings
   b. Expanded course outlines and samples of course materials, student work, grades, exams and other assessments, grade distribution, etc.
   c. Statistical data for the department comparing the program with similar programs in California and the nation, such as:
      1. number of students in the major
      2. demand for the program (student applications)
      3. GPA and SAT scores (average)
      4. retention and graduation rate (throughput)
      5. job market for graduating students; i.e., company interviews
6. student demographics
7. recruitment efforts of department
8. awards and honors received by students
9. other data required by the Academic Senate Program Review & Improvement Committee
10. supplemental facilities; e.g., library, computers

2. All documentation must be available to reviewers at least one month ahead of visitation.

B. On-site visitation

1. Reviewers to consider the following guidelines:
   a. Department objectives:
      1. what are the goals of the department for the next five years?
      2. how does the department plan to meet its five-year goal?
   b. Curriculum
      1. what significant changes have been made in the curricula in the last five years?
      2. what are the current and anticipated objectives of the department?
      3. what are the distinguishing features of the program?
      4. are there emerging trends or areas within the discipline which should be included?
      5. are there out-of-date elements which should be phased out or deleted?
      6. how could the program be improved through better resource support or use?
   c. Faculty
      1. what research or other special projects are the department faculty pursuing?
      2. what other faculty development programs are present in the department?
      3. what faculty development programs are planned, including sponsored projects from external agencies?
   d. Summary
      1. what are the strengths and achievements of the program?
      2. what improvements should the department make? Include a time table for implementation.
      3. what are the most important problems facing the department?

2. Visit with department chair/head and the dean to establish the administration's interest and vision for the department.

3. Visit with different faculty groups if there is more than one major in the department.
4. Visit physical facilities, equipment, laboratories (if applicable).

5. Visit with representative students.

6. The exit-visit with the department head and dean should be followed by a meeting with the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

C. Written report

The chair of the review panel is responsible for the written report; however, s/he may delegate this responsibility to another member. The written report should be submitted no later than 45 days after the review.

D. Expenses

The dean or Vice President for Academic Affairs will cover the expenses.

E. Post review

The President or designee will respond to the report within six months after the submission of the report.
TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Ron Brown
Physics Department
SUBJECT: ATHLETICS AND THE UNIVERSITY

Over the last several years, we have engaged in a number of important discussions: We developed a strategic plan which articulates how we currently view ourselves as a university and where we think we should be heading (at least within the paradigm of being a part of a regulated campus within the CSU system); we have explored the concept of a charter university and what we might be able to accomplish with a change in the paradigm; we have committees that are currently exploring the broader concepts of academic governance and employee relations and fiscal flexibility - issues we would want to have thought about were we to gain some local autonomy through either a charter or an agreement with the CSU; we have discussed diversity issues and cultural pluralism; we have discussed curricular issues and the calendar - not just from the viewpoint of how or whether to change them, but from the perspective of what we are trying to accomplish as a university and how changes in calendar or curriculum or the general education program in particular could work to improve what we are trying to do for our graduates. We have not always agreed with each other on these various issues. But we have engaged in these discussions with the understanding that our individual positions have been based on what we feel is best for the university and its programs and its students.

We are being asked to consider developing a Cal Poly Plan as part of a broad agreement with the CSU system that would offer some freedom to this campus in exchange for a commitment to expand what we do and a commitment that we would explore what should be meant by "educational quality" and "productivity in an academic setting" and what the metrics of quality and productivity might be. We won't all agree on these issues either. But we will all engage in the discussions from the perspective of how our decisions will affect the quality of the education that we can offer at this university.

But one set of questions has not been a part of any of our discussion: What do we feel is the proper role of intercollegiate athletics in the university setting? What level of competition is consistent with our academic mission at Cal Poly? Is it an integral part of the academic program of the university? If so, how does it fit in with the other academic goals of the university? What do we feel the athletic program should try to accomplish for our students? I don't know how I would answer those questions. But I would like for the conversation to occur. I would like to hear the arguments that would establish the proper balance between the academic mission and the legitimate role for athletic competition at this university.

The questions about the proper role of athletics and the level at which this university will participate, it seems, have been decided elsewhere. Yet those decisions affect the rest of the university - as we see in the question that is before us now. Our role in this seems to be limited to deciding whether we will try to block a decision that has already been made - the placing of our sports complex on prime agricultural land that us being used for other purposes that are consistent with the academic mission of the university. We have not been asked to consider whether a sports complex is consistent with the academic mission of the university. I might well agree that such a facility is important. I might even agree that the proposed site is, on balance, best for the university. But that question should not be where this discussion of athletics and the university begins.
FACULTY PLAN

In offering our alternative, we have proceeded on the assumption that "The Committee" (Campus Committee, Pipeline, Tunnel, Poly Rump, ... whatever we decide to call it) will function so as to embody the six principles we have entertained so far: Communication, Openness, Consultation, Timely Involvement, Mutual Responsibility and Leadership. We want to restrict its policy-making power to solely those issues which directly affect the entire campus community, for example, parking and the budget. On all other matters, The Committee will function as an entrepot for issues affecting the manifold constituencies of the Campus. Here all groups will have the opportunity to share in a timely manner concerns which bear on them and the community at large. In this way, all will be informed, consulted and have the opportunity to participate in the generation of understanding and the prospect of achieving a comfortable level of consensus. It would be improper for this group to voice the final recommendation to the Board of Trustees or its representative on matters pertaining exclusively or primarily to one or only some of the Campus constituencies. To the degree that The Committee is recommending on matters that involve all the campus community, it will be incorporating the six principles, and perhaps others as well (for instance, fairness, comity, good manners, generosity, et cetera).

At least some dimensions of Leadership or Mutual Responsibility resides with The Committee in all of its functions, such as when it acts primarily in the capacity of information conduit and mutual soundingboard as well as when it is acting as a policy-making organ. In all its functions, it must express the support of all its constituents otherwise it will lapse into irrelevancy and join the other spooks we are forever attempting to exorcise. How well it maintains the dedication, attention and respect of the community will depend on the importance of the issues discussed. Although all issues may be broached, some (for example, the sacking of the men's and women's basketball coaches) may best be left for the editorial pages of the Mustang Daily. However, the athletic budget allocation would be open for discussion!

Just as the faculty think that there may be issues which exclusively concern one or a few of the constituency groups, so are there some areas over which the faculty remains jealously protective. Among these are the following: the Academic Senate is the official voice of the Cal Poly faculty; the Senate shall be the formal policy-recommending body on decisions pertaining to the following matters: minimum admission requirements for students, minimum conditions for the award of certificates and degrees to students,
the academic conduct of students and the means for handling infractions, curricula and research programs, developing of policies governing the awarding of grades, minimum criteria and standards to be used for programs designed to enhance and maintain professional competence, including the awarding of academic leaves, campuswide aspects of academic planning.

the Senate shall be consulted on campuswide aspects of: program review, the basic direction of academic support programs, and policies governing the appointment of the president and academic administrators.

the faculty has the primary responsibility to recommend to the president the criteria and standards for the appointment, retention, awarding of tenure, promotion and evaluation of academic employees, including preservation of the principle of peer evaluation and provision for the direct involvement of appropriate faculty in these decisions; to determine the membership of the General Faculty; recommend on faculty appointments to institutional task forces, advisory committees and auxiliary organizations; and set academic standards and academic policies governing athletics.
FACULTY PLAN

SCOPE OF AUTHORITY

The Committee's paramount policymaking recommendations to the president would be limited solely to those issues involving the entire campus community, such as, parking or the distribution of the budget. In matters traditionally the prerogative of the faculty, such as the curriculum, the content and definition of what constitutes a baccalaureate class or the qualifications of persons entitled to teach such classes, the faculty insist on having the final say, after appropriate consultation with interested parties, before transmitting their recommendation to the president. Students and administration currently have representation in the senate and committees pertinent to their involvement.

MEMBERSHIP

The distribution of the members would not be so critical to the faculty so long as the faculty exercise last say over matters recognized as falling under their responsibility and so long as the distribution reflects the fact that this is a university and the academic side must be safeguarded. With that in mind, we suggest the following distribution: five faculty, three students, two staff, and one administrator.

AGENDA SETTING

This issue will always stimulate controversy because external exigencies may crowd out very important internal concerns. What the Committee is primarily concerned with is taking the long view so as to address issues in such a fashion as to avoid having to be forced into a posture of crisis management. That will take patience and good will on the part of the representatives of the various constituencies. All issues may be given an audience but the members, through the development of mutual trust, have to reconcile themselves to the reality that all won't be given priority. Constituencies will transmit issues through their representatives on the Committee and the Committee will rank and address them as it sees fit.

RESPONSIBILITY/ACCOUNTABILITY

The Committee will recommend policy on matters pertaining to all and act as a conduit of accurate information to the campus constituencies. Success breeds success, and its function as a source and transmission of information will in time become more secure. Communication flows in both directions and the representatives on the Committee must be watchful not to introduce personal static and other interference with the flow.
FEASIBILITY

As organizations go, universities have one of the longest traditions of success in the western world. The faculty does not favor disturbing those areas lacking a demonstrative need of repair. The Committee will achieve its greatest contribution to the improvement of campus governance by focussing on those areas needing attention.

TIMELINESS

Timeliness is defined by the function performed. To the extent that the intent is reaching a consensus on an issue campuswide, the matter is involved and reiterative and will consume what will appear to be countless hours. Our recent experience with the Strategic Plan is a good example of a task consonant with the time expended. On the other hand, a mere piece of information or the quelling of a rumor can be accomplished in the twinkling of an eye—if it emanates from the proper source. This gets us to the next section.

CONSULTATION & INVOLVEMENT

If the aforementioned categories are sincerely engaged, then consultation, involvement, and the next category, communication, will follow.

COMMUNICATION

Please see Consultation and Involvement above. Of the three, communication is the easiest and will occur by default if consultation and involvement are seriously pursued.
Academic Senate Instruction Committee

GRADE CHANGE RESOLUTION INFORMATION

May 2, 1995

The Problem:
The original grade change resolution (AS 384-92) did not provide a clear mechanism for resolving the inevitable exceptions. Exceptions are defined as cases:

- exceeding the one year time limit,
- other than administrative or university error,
- lacking documentation sufficient to withstand audit, or
- otherwise appealed by a faculty member.

AS 384-92 already makes provision for changing grades during the first year when the changes are necessitated by:

- administrative or university error,
- personal illness,
- family emergency, or
- inability to communicate with the instructor prior to the 7th week deadline.

These situations, when sufficiently documented to sustain audit, are processed automatically by the Academic Records Office.

Relevant Existing Policy:

AS 384-92 states that:

"Changes of Authorized Incomplete and Satisfactory Progress symbols will occur as the student completes the required course work, and therefore such action does not normally require a request for a change of grade on the part of a student."

Executive Order 268:

Policies and procedures relating to grades of I or SP are described in EO 268 as follows (bold is not in the original):

"An Incomplete shall be removed within one year following the end of the term during which it was assigned; provided, however, that
extension of the one-year time limit may be granted by petition for contingencies such as intervening military service and serious health or personal problems. If the Incomplete is not removed within the prescribed time limit, or any extension thereof, it shall be counted as a failing grade in calculating grade point average and progress points."

"The 'SP' symbol shall be replaced with the appropriate final grade within one year of its assignment except for Master's thesis enrollment, in which case the time limit shall be established by the appropriate campus authority. The President or his designee may authorize extension of established time limits."

The Solution:

Our resolution proposes that a faculty subcommittee from the Instruction Committee will meet quarterly to review and make recommendations on all exceptional cases. This review process will be patterned after the procedures adopted by the Senate Fairness Board.

After a period of one year, it is the intent of the Instruction Committee to study the disposition of these cases. If patterns are evident, the grade change policy may be further refined.

Advantages of the Solution:

- Maintaining the one year time limit in the typical case is consistent with EO 268 and encourages student throughput.

- Supporting AS 384-92 provides an historical record that will sustain audits by accreditation agencies, federal financial aid agencies, and the NCAA.

- Objective faculty will be making the recommendations regarding exceptional cases.

- If patterns appear in the cases studied by the Faculty Subcommittee after one year, these patterns may be used to further refine the grade change policy.

We strongly urge you to support the grade change resolution as presented by the Instruction Committee.
Resolution on Change of Grades

David Dubbink, City and Regional Planning

The Academic Senate Instruction Committee has proposed several modifications to the previously adopted policy on change of grades. The proposed changes allow for correction of errors and provide for a process to deal with exceptional situations.

However, proposed modifications do not address the difficulties faced by students in internships and practicums, or students who interrupt course work and then return to school. With the internships or practicums, difficulties related to the work assignment can interfere with completion of the required internship hours. An Incomplete (I) is assigned in the interim. It is also not unusual for students who are working their way through school to take a quarter off to earn money to continue in school. In our department's curriculum there is a three course sequence of Senior project related courses and a grade of Incomplete (I) is commonly assigned to partially completed work. Additionally, students in the Master's program normally receive an Incomplete (I) for courses linked to thesis preparation until the thesis is approved.

In addition to dealing with errors and exceptions the Senate Policy on Grade Changes should also recognize that circumstances arise that make timely completion of work impossible. The policy amendment offered below, makes it possible for students foreseeing difficulties to petition for an extension of time to complete course work related to internships, practicums, senior projects and theses. The present policy text, with the revision in italics, is as follows:

Changes of Authorized Incomplete and Satisfactory Progress symbols will occur as the student completes the required course work, and therefore such action does not normally require a request for a change of grade on the part of a student. After one year has passed from the end of the term a grade of No Credit (NC) shall be recorded for such courses. A student may request, and a department may grant, reasonable extensions of time for completion of work in internships, practicums, and to classes linked to completion of senior projects and theses. Such agreements will be made in advance of the extension and shall specify a schedule for completion of work. Departments will submit appropriate documentation of this to the Registrar when requesting grade changes. Any other request for a change of grade will not be considered after one year from the end of the term during which the grade was awarded.

The application of No Credit, rather than an administratively assigned F relates to the problem caused when a student seeks readmission to the program to complete a degree after an extended absence. The administrative F's can lower their GPA to a point where they cannot be readmitted.
ADDITIONAL MATERIALS FOR BUSINESS ITEM C, RESOLUTION ON CAGR LAND USE.

Agribusiness Department
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 13, 1995

TO: Joe Jen, Dean
College of Agriculture

FROM: Ken Scott, Chairman
Land Use Task Force

SUBJECT: Proposed Athletic Facility Location

The following is submitted to you as a result of your request that the CAGR Land Use Task Force provide a list of its major concerns regarding the development of Fields 28 and 29 for athletic facilities.

Many of our concerns are expressed in committee's previous memoranda on the topic. In particular, the original memorandum addressed to John McCutcheon, dated January 11, 1995, details some of the major concerns of the task force. I have included a copy of that memorandum. In addition, I am taking the opportunity to include the memorandum from John Harris to President Baker which is dated January 27, 1995. I think John makes some salient points which were not solicited by the Land Use Task Force but do reflect some of the feelings I have heard expressed by committee members.

In addition, I would like to emphasize the following concerns. I will try to list the newest or least expressed concerns first, since they seem to hold more weight with the administration than do any “old concerns that have already been addressed.” Otherwise, the ordering of the list is not meant to convey any order of importance.

1. Student Safety
   As I understand it is planned that the students will walk to the sporting events from the campus core. There is a railroad track that separates the students from the proposed facility. The crossing adjacent to the current football stadium has been the scene of four train/automobile-pedestrian mishaps that have included two deaths. What thought has been given to student safety and how do you protect students who have just finished a “good time” at a football game from trying to beat the on-coming train?

2. Student Traffic
   Increased access by students and the general public to the proposed new facilities will impact agricultural production activities on other fields in the area. First, students and the general public walking to the proposed facilities from campus will nullify the production efforts in the mature citrus and avocado orchards along the railroad track. Secondly, increased traffic in the area will jeopardize production activities on the rest of the prime ag lands as the existing roads and work yards become subject to overflow, or more convenient, parking. An additional problem will arise over time. As public access in the area is increased, so too will the trespass problems on all of the prime agricultural lands which lie west of the railroad tracks. Indeed, the development of the athletic facilities on Fields 28-29 increases the risk of losing agricultural production and the educational use of the rest of the prime...
agricultural lands lying west of the railroad tracks. The suggestion that small plots of land to be used for agricultural production could be incorporated into the proposed landscape for the athletic facility indicates to me that someone, somewhere, does not understand the relationship between agricultural production and public access.

3. Traffic Flows
The primary route for vehicle traffic to and from the proposed facilities will be Highway 1 at Highland Drive. It is hard to imagine that city planners, city and state police, Caltrans, and other affected agencies or individuals will be excited about dumping major traffic onto Santa Rosa Avenue when San Luis Obispo is searching for ways to decrease the impact of vehicle traffic on this road. How long will it take to accommodate the football stadium traffic at the Highland Drive/Highway 1 stoplight? Would it not be better to have the stadium located east of the railroad tracks where Grand and California Avenues will serve as the major access routes?

4. Water Quality
How can you maintain the water quality of the two creeks with the impacts of increased human contact. The Water Quality Board will be very slow to approve of any change in the use of these lands that increases human impacts on resource quality. I understand the Central Coast Water Quality Control Board requires setbacks of 100 feet along each of the two creeks that transverse the property. This does not leave much room for the development of athletic facilities.

In addition, all water runoff must be controlled. The Clean Water Act of 1994, concerning non-point source pollution, states very clearly that all non-point sources, including parking lots that are new construction shall not have runoff go directly into streams and creeks. I understand parking areas will not be paved to help control runoff, but what about wet weather parking. Lawn parking will not be possible during inclement weather. Paper and other debris will blow into the creeks and the natural vegetation along these riparian areas. Human impact endangers these areas and could eventually alter, if not destroy, them.

5. Future Agricultural Uses.
The coastal valleys of California are a unique agricultural resource. They are valleys marked with excellent soils, water supplies, and moderate climates which are conducive to producing fresh fruits and vegetables during periods when production in other parts of the United States is not possible. Many of our fresh fruits and vegetables we find in the supermarkets either would not be there or would certainly be more expensive, if it were not for the production in the California coastal valleys. Society continues to convert these coastal valleys to urban and other uses. Orange County was once one of these coastal agricultural valleys. Now it is not. The Oxnard plain is currently being overrun by development. View the continued expansion of Santa Maria. The Salinas Valley will soon follow. It will be difficult to teach the student of the importance of prime agricultural areas and pass by the proposed athletic complex in fields 28-29 on the same day, perhaps it will be even harder for the student to comprehend.

I would like to see the fields left in agricultural production. They provide excellent opportunities for future research and study of the urban-ag interface. This
is an issue that affects a large segment of the California Agricultural community because of the conversion of prime land in coastal valleys. This conversion occurs because of the difficulties involved in farming on this interface. How can we make it more economically feasible to maintain this land in agricultural production? What types of high intensity enterprises might make this possible? What role would organic farming and IPM technologies have? How well would direct marketing to the urban consumers through roadside stands work?

I can see the possibilities of turning Fields 28-29 over to interdisciplinary groups of students and faculty who would work in concert through the foundation to operate the enterprise. Agribusiness students might be given the responsibilities to supervise the budgeting of the proposed crops, to obtain the financing by meeting with Foundation personnel, to keep the financial records, and to market the crops. Students studying agricultural production would be given responsibilities to grow the crops and to supervise the harvest. Working together, Cal Poly could become the leading university undertaking this type of work and research. The proximity of these fields to the urban fringe and the exposure they offer would provide a unique setting for this effort which cannot be duplicated anywhere else, on or off campus.

I know this concept runs counter to the Crops Department's future use plans for these fields if the athletic facility is not built, but I offer it anyway.

6. Replacement Values
I am not convinced that the concept of replacement value applies to fields 28-29. It is difficult to envision any replacement property that would offer the access and proximity to campus that these fields do. I know that the concept of busing students and faculty to outlying reaches of campus or to additional lands is proposed. The concept of busing, while valid, will ultimately prove impractical. The long term commitment during budgetary setbacks is questionable. In addition, ultimately, students and faculty alike begin to forget the distant parcel of land. It has happened at other universities. I believe there is a direct correlation between proximity to campus and educational usefulness. This was understood by the earlier administrations at Cal Poly. These lands were purchased by the State, piece by piece, from the surrounding land owners to empower the College of Agriculture to truly teach through the learning by doing concept. It worked, but only because the land was close to the campus core.

I think a more useful approach is to ask why the proposed athletic complex cannot be relocated to non-prime lands. Its development does not require prime agricultural lands. The highest and best use for prime, Class I land is agriculture. Why does a university that stands at the forefront of service to the California agricultural industry want to convert an agricultural land base from its highest and best use to some secondary use? This facility will occupy forty percent of our prime lands on campus and impact all of it. On the other hand, if it is relocated to non-prime campus lands, it will occupy less than one percent of these acres. This will minimize the magnitude of the loss to the College, as a whole, and the impact on our abilities to offer our programs. At the same time, the campus will still have an athletic facility that is not hampered in its abilities to fulfill its function.

Enclosures