I. Minutes: Approval of the Academic Senate minutes for January 25, February 15, February 22, and March 8, 1994 (pp. 2-7).

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

A. Nominations are being received for the positions of Academic Senate Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary for the 1994-1995 term. Please contact the Academic Senate office if you would like a nomination form. Nominations due April 26, 1994.

B. Academic Senate election results for 1994-1995 (pp. 8-9).

C. Resolutions approved by President Baker:
   AS-409-93/EX Charter Campus for Cal Poly
   AS-412-93/DSTF Promoting Representation at Cal Poly (p. 10).
   AS-413-93/DSTF Establishing the Educational Equity Commission as a Standing University-wide Committee (p. 10).
   AS-415-94/IE Department Name Change for the Industrial Engineering Department
   AS-420-94/1ACC "Cal Poly Instructional Computing Strategic Plan: A Networked Instructional Environment"

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. ASI Representatives

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):

A. Resolution on Department Name Change for Ornamental Horticulture-Hannings for the O.H. Department, second reading (pp. 11-15).
B. Resolution on Department Designation Change for the Architecture Department-Cooper/Bagnall, Directors for the Architecture Department, second reading (pp. 16-21).
C. Resolution on Calendar-A. Brown, Chair of the Instruction Committee, second reading (pp. 22-25).
D. Resolution on Definitions of Professional Programs, Technical Programs, and Significant Majority-Nulman, Chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee, second reading (p. 26).
F. Resolution on Campus Policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects-Gish, Director for Ethnic Studies, first reading (pp. 30-38).

------------------ continued on page two
G. Resolution on The Review of Telecommunications Course Offerings as New Courses—Dana/Nulman/Vilkatis, first reading (p. 39).

H. Resolution on Revision of the Faculty Code of Ethics—Terry, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, first reading (pp. 40-42).

I. Resolution on Diversity Proposal for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure—Terry, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, first reading (pp. 43-52).

J. GE&B proposals for ENGL 355, SPAN 340, and GRC 277—Vilkatis, Co-Chair of the GE&B Committee, first reading (pp. 53-55).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
ACADEMIC SENATE MEMBERSHIP
1994-1995

(The individuals whose names are printed in bold type are newly elected senators for the 1994-1995/6 term. The remaining individuals are continuing senators whose term ends in June 1995.)

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE  (7 senators)
Academic Senate
Amspacher, William
Bermann, James
Hampson, Brian
Hannings, David
Lord, Sarah
McNeil, Robert
Ruehr, Thomas

Agribusiness
Agricultural Engineering
Food Science and Nutrition
Ornamental Horticulture
Home Economics
Crop Science
Soil Science

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN (5 senators)
Academic Senate
Berrio, Mark
Dubbink, David
McDonald, Margot
Turnquist, Ed
VACANCY

Architectural Engineering
City and Regional Planning
Architecture
Construction Management

Research Committee
VACANCY

UPLC
VACANCY

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS (5 senators)
Academic Senate
Bertozzi, Dan
Burgunder, Lee
Randazzo, Anthony
Weatherford, Alan
VACANCY

Business Administration
Business Administration
Industrial Technology
Business Administration

Research Committee
VACANCY

UPLC
VACANCY

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING (7 senators)
Academic Senate
Brown, Ken
Dana, Charles
Kolkailah, Faysal
Lo, Chien-Kuo (Kurt)
LoCascio, James
Wheatley, Patrick
Wilson, Jack

Manufacturing
Computer Science
Aeronautical Engineering
Civil and Environmental Engineering
Mechanical Engineering
Computer Science
Mechanical Engineering
ACADEMIC SENATE MEMBERSHIP
1994-1995

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS (9 senators)

Academic Senate
DeLey, Warren  Social Sciences
Fetzer, Philip  Political Science
Hampsey, John  English
Martínez, William  Foreign Languages and Literatures
Mott, Stephen  Graphic Communication
Scriven, Talmage  Philosophy
Spiller, William  Music
Weatherby, Joseph  Political Science

Research Committee
Krieger, Daniel  History

UPLC
Lutrin, Carl  Political Science

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS (8 senators)

Academic Senate
Bowker, Leslie  Biological Sciences
Brown, Andrea  Physical Education
Brown, Ronald  Physics
Cook, Gayle  Physics
Farrell, Gerald  Mathematics
Lewis, George  Mathematics

Research Committee
Goers, John  Chemistry

UPLC
VACANCY

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES (5 senators total, 1 from the Library and 4 from other areas)

Academic Senate
Fryer, Ann  Disabled Student Services
Jones, Carolyn  Career Services
Lutrin, Sam  Student Life & Activities
Pritchard, Eileen  Library

Research Committee
VACANCY

UPLC
VACANCY

UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (1 senator)

Academic Senate
VACANCY

STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE (3 statewide senators)
Hale, Thomas  Mathematics
Kersten, Timothy  Economics
Vilkitis, James  NRM
MEMORANDUM

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
    President

Date: March 14, 1994

Subject: RESPONSE TO ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTIONS 411-413

Resolution 411

It is my intention that this element of the strategic plan continue to be given a high priority by all elements of the campus as your resolution suggests. The suggestion of a visiting professors' program is a good one, and each college has been asked what it plans to do to promote faculty diversity in the next year and beyond.

Resolution 412

Enrollment and employment data will show that the University has established a positive gradient in the change of the numbers of underrepresented people in both the student and staff categories. Trends are less clear with the faculty, but this remains a high priority for me and for the University as this resolution reaffirms.

Resolution 413

I support the formation and operation of an Educational Equity Commission as described in this Resolution. I will take the necessary action to form the Educational Equity Commission as outlined in the next to last resolved clause.

I have transmitted these Senate resolutions to the deans and the program managers along with my response. Thank you very much for your careful consideration of these issues to improve diversity on the campus and promote sensitivity to the changing needs of our students.
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS- -93/
RESOLUTION ON
DEPARTMENT NAME CHANGE FOR THE
ORNAMENTAL HORTICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Background statement: During the first program review process it was suggested to the Ornamental Horticulture Department that the department name was possibly out-of-date and no longer representative of the true nature of the industry or curriculum. Since that time the department has been discussing a name change in consultation with its industry advisory council, the Dean for the College of Agriculture, and other programs in the college. As a result of these discussions, the following recommendation is submitted.

WHEREAS, The term "environmental horticulture" has become the identifiable name of the industry that the Ornamental Horticulture Department serves; and

WHEREAS, What was once the Ornamental Horticulture industry in California has developed and matured into a 12 billion dollar environmental service industry which is a necessary part of the everyday life of many people; and

WHEREAS, Other Ornamental Horticulture departments in the country have adopted the term "environmental horticulture" to better identify the current direction of what is called the "Green Industry"; and

WHEREAS, The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language defines horticulture as "the science or art of cultivating plants"; and

WHEREAS, The professional society for horticulturists is the American Society for Horticultural Science (which is also a professional society for faculty in the Fruit Science, Crop Science, and Vegetable Science programs at Cal Poly); and

WHEREAS, The Ornamental Horticulture Department, with the enthusiastic concurrence of the industry it serves, feels that the name Environmental Horticultural Science more accurately reflects the nature of its program; and

WHEREAS, The request for this name change has been approved by the College of Agriculture Council and the Dean for the College of Agriculture; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the name of the Ornamental Horticulture Department be changed to the ENVIRONMENTAL HORTICULTURAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT.

Proposed by: The Ornamental Horticulture Department
December 7, 1993
MEMORANDUM

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Robert D. Koob
      Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: DEPARTMENTAL NAME CHANGE REQUEST—ORNAMENTAL HORTICULTURE

Date: November 18, 1993
File No.:
Copies: Glenn Irvin
        Joseph Jen
        Steve Angley

Attached is a request from the Ornamental Horticulture Department to change their department name to "Environmental Horticultural Science". I would appreciate your having the Academic Senate review this matter and make a recommendation as soon as possible.

Thanks for your assistance in this matter.

Attachment
TO: Dr. Robert D. Koob, Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Dr. Joseph J. Jen, Dean
        College of Agriculture

cc: Mr. Steve Angley
     Dr. Walter R. Mark

SUBJECT: ORNAMENTAL HORTICULTURE DEPARTMENT NAME CHANGE

The Ornamental Horticulture Department has requested that its name be changed from "Ornamental Horticulture" to "Environmental Horticultural Science." The rationale supporting this request is expressed in Steve Angley's memorandum dated November 3, 1993 (see attached).

The College of Agriculture Department Heads' Council is in full support of this department name change. We now submit this request to you for approval.

Attachment

Approved: __________________________

Robert D. Koob
MEMORANDUM

Ornamental Horticulture Department

November 3, 1993

TO: Joseph J. Jen, Dean
College of Agriculture

FROM: Stephen F. Angley, Interim Department Head
Ornamental Horticulture

SUBJECT: Department Name Change

At the request of and with the support of our Advisory Council and all faculty in the Ornamental Horticulture Department, we request that the Ornamental Horticulture Department name be changed to Environmental Horticultural Science. We would like this to occur as soon as possible.

We request the name change for the following reasons:

1. To clarify and reflect the department's association with industry, which has moved to the name environmental horticulture.
2. To promote our program better to students and constituents.
3. To promote the fact that our program is based strongly in the sciences, we feel it should be reflected in our name.

Attached is a copy of the name change proposal submitted by our department with our curriculum packet for 1994-96, which has been approved by the CAGR Curriculum Committee.

We are excited about the name change and feel it will make us more recognizable and feel strongly that it will greatly enhance our recruiting efforts.

Attachment
Department Name Change Proposal

ORNAMENTAL HORTICULTURE
To
ENVIRONMENTAL HORTICULTURAL SCIENCE

The department name change is planned in order to more correctly identify our department's emphasis. The term environmental horticulture has become the identifiable name of the industry our department serves. What was once the Ornamental Horticulture industry has developed and matured into a major environmental service industry. It has become a necessary part of our everyday life and environment.

Our program is based strongly in the sciences, which should also be reflected in our name. We also feel it is appropriate, since many other department names contain the word science.

In addition, our Departmental Advisory Council strongly recommends our name change to Environmental Horticultural Science. They feel, as do we, that the new name will keep us current with the industry as it is today and will have an even greater impact in the future.

We would like this change to be effective as soon as possible.
WHEREAS, The Architecture Department requests that its department's designation be changed to the SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE; and

WHEREAS, The request for a department designation change has been approved by the College of Architecture and Environmental Design Department Head's Council; the Dean of the College of Architecture and Environmental Design; the Dean's Council; and the Vice President for Academic Affairs; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the name of the Architecture Department be changed to THE SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

Proposed by: The Architecture Department
July 15, 1993
This is in response to your initial memorandum of January 26, 1993, at which time you requested that the Architecture Department be designated as the School of Architecture. Based upon the unanimous positive recommendation of the Academic Deans' Council on June 7, 1993, and the justifications noted in your and the Department's memoranda, I am hereby approving the redesignation to be effective July 1, 1993.
January 26, 1993

To: Robert Koob, Vice President
    Academic Affairs

From: Paul R. Neel, Dean
      College of Architecture and Environmental Design

Subject: REQUEST FOR "SCHOOL" DESIGNATION

Bob, this is the proposal to change the Architecture Department designation to the School of Architecture which we discussed last month. At that time you expressed concern over the management level of the organization. I believe the enclosed memo from Allan Cooper and Jim Bagnall explains that the new model does not create any new layers of management as the directors are at the same level as the department heads. The director designation is only interim until we decide whether these managers will have program or functional responsibilities.

The advantages of a School designation are more external than internal. This fact is pointed out in the attached memo. I fully support this request and am anxious to discuss the procedures of implementation.

Attachment

ARCH.School.Des
DESIGNATION CHANGE:
A CHARTER FOR THE SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

I. BACKGROUND

The Architectural Engineering Department was established in 1948 within the School of Engineering. In 1952, the Architecture Program was formed, separate from the Architectural Engineering Department.

In the intervening years, conditions evolved which required that both departments move out from under the "umbrella" of the Engineering School. The School of Architecture and Environmental Design was formed to accommodate Architecture, Architectural Engineering, and City and Regional Planning and has grown to include Landscape Architecture and Construction Management. In 1992 the School became a "College" to more accurately reflect its size, enrollment and diversity of degree offerings.

The Architecture Department has developed a highly regarded and nationally recognized "school" of thought - a unique, "professionally focused" curriculum - which has helped it to attain the stature normally associated with the "school" designation.

Now, in order for the Architecture Department to better accomplish its mission - which is to:

a. better involve constituencies of degree programs and expanding special study options within degrees in the decision-making process;

b. better support the individual needs of a diverse student, faculty and staff population; providing diverse and comprehensive educational opportunities; and

c. more accurately reflect its existing structure, a program with a director and semi-autonomous sub-units offering two degrees and five special study options (with others currently in the planning stage); and to operate at a par with other large, diverse architecture programs within the United States, the Cal Poly Architecture Department shall be designated "School of Architecture." (It should be noted that this is a designation change only. It is not the intention to reorganize the Architecture Department into a School of Architecture within which reside individual Departments.)

II. STATEMENT OF VALUES

The School of Architecture supports the Cal Poly Strategic Planning Document which reads in part: "By the end of Fall Quarter 1992, Cal Poly shall recommend a
governance structure which involves constituencies in the decision-making process.”

The School of Architecture also supports the College of Architecture and Environmental Design Goals which read in part: “The CAED shall promote an environment that positively influences, guides, and supports the individual educational needs of a diverse student, faculty, and staff population; and emphasizes a teaching/learning/personal growth process that encourages the School's unique close relationship between students and faculty.”

The School of Architecture retains the Architecture Department Goal and Educational Objective which reads in part: “To provide diverse and comprehensive educational opportunities for persons preparing to serve society as responsible, creative professionals involved in problem recognition, problem analysis and problem solving.”

III. SUMMARY OF GOALS

The Architecture Department wishes to maintain its size and increase the diversity of its course offerings, while enhancing its ability to effectively manage itself. The Department wishes to maintain its size in order to: maintain the quality and diversity of the program, faculty and students required to support the university's goals for Educational Equity and Affirmative Action; support the College's “Goal C” pertaining to the needs of a diverse student, faculty and staff population; support the School's Goal and Educational Objectives pertaining to providing a diverse and comprehensive education; and respond to overwhelming demand by society, students, employers and the region. To increase efficiency within such a large department and to support the University's goals pertaining to governance and collegiality, a new organizational structure has been adopted. The Director is assisted by an Advisory Board representing each of the six instructional areas in the School.

IV. OPPORTUNITY SOUGHT

The “School” designation is consistent with the name commonly applied to similar diverse and large programs in the United States. The Cal Poly School of Architecture is the largest accredited undergraduate architecture program in North America. Of the fifteen largest architecture programs in North America, only two have the designation of “department.” The program's diversity is reflected in the fact that the School of Architecture currently offers two professional degree programs (BArch and MSArch) and is initiating a new integrated BArch/MBA program. The undergraduate and graduate programs are comprised of a number of fifth year concentrations and graduate special study areas with the near-term proposed addition of new programs such as Interior Architecture. The Graduate Program has an overall enrollment of 38 students, while the Undergraduate Program has an overall enrollment of 826 students.
The School of Architecture offers a professional program leading to registration and licensure. Professional programs of this type (i.e., law and medicine) are normally designated "schools."

The only professional association of architecture programs in North America is entitled the "Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture" (ACSA). Our program's stature within that organization will be greatly enhanced through this name change.

As the School of Architecture moves more aggressively into the area of fund raising and development, the prestige associated with the "School" designation will be recognized by potential philanthropic and private donors.

Under the "School" designation, a more efficient management plan is made possible whereby more governing authority can be delegated to subunits within the School without requiring additional resources, or additional levels of personnel review.

The departmental model required that the entire faculty (40-50 full- and part-time faculty) be assembled to advise on administrative decisions, address scheduling problems, implement budget changes, and/or other crucial areas of departmental administration. When response time did not permit assembling the entire faculty, the department head was forced to act without appropriate input. The current "School" management model enhances faculty communication and offers an avenue of representation for specialty areas within the discipline. A small group of faculty representatives, or "associate directors," currently hold both regular and emergency meetings to fully represent the faculty in the decision-making process. Without creating an additional layer of supervision or personnel review and without investing the "associate directors" with fiscal or management authority, the advisory body is able to provide the Director with valuable input on policies related to scheduling, budget allocations, admissions, productivity, curriculum, workload, facility utilization, professional development, and management policy.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

The Department of Architecture proposes approval of this Charter in time for the Spring 1994 NAAB accreditation visit.
WHEREAS, Cal Poly is one of four CSU universities funded on a year-round calendar thus an academic calendar needs to be designed for 12-month periods; and

WHEREAS, The proposed academic calendar consisting of three equal 15-week terms including final examinations meets all five criteria defined by interested parties; and

WHEREAS, *Carnegie unit time can be met by having 14 weeks of instruction with class times increased to 55-minutes each; and

WHEREAS, The results of a survey reported in April 1993, indicated that 60 percent of faculty wanted some changes in the calendaring system; and

WHEREAS, There are significant curriculum-related features:

1. A more flexible learning environment can be developed allowing for a higher level of evaluation and appreciation of knowledge;
2. The increased teaching periods and length of trimester will provide time for more continuity in teaching concepts and ideas, thus there will be less fragmentation of topics;
3. The increased teaching periods and length of trimester will provide more time for senior project which is especially valuable for empirical research and experimentation;
4. Fewer and longer courses will be taken by students which should provide for synthesis and application of subject matter which is beneficial to the learning process;
5. The proposal could facilitate curricular revisions which could address such problems as (a) general education and breadth content, structure, and scheduling [according to a recent survey, this is the most significant problem in the slow throughput at Cal Poly], (b) programs with low numbers of elective classes, (c) excessive overloading of required support and core classes, and (d) lack of adequate staffing; and

WHEREAS, There are significant features beneficial to students:

1. The proposal could facilitate easier articulation for transfer;
2. There will be fewer final examinations, registration, etc.;
3. The proposal will provide a longer period of time for new/transfer students to adjust to Cal Poly;
4. The proposal could facilitate easier coordination with school districts for student-teacher assignments;
5. There will be a greater period of time for students to regain studies in a class after an illness or personal problem;
6. There will be more time to form and develop student-teacher mentor relationships;
7. There will be more time to form and develop study and cooperative learning groups;
8. Finishing the first trimester of the year will provide for easier entrance into summer employment;
9. More meaningful midterm grades will be given;
10. There will be more time for participation in student/cultural affairs;
11. The extra time in class will allow for analysis and synthesis, not just knowledge gathering;
12. There will be more time to review class material;
13. There will be less pressure to choose research topic/term paper subjects in a hurried uninformed way;
14. There will be more time for substantive library and laboratory investigation;
15. In terms of proportion there will be less time spent in taking exams and more in learning;
16. There will be significant reduction in "red tape" concerning add, drop, schedules, grades, etc.;
17. Class content is the same in all three trimesters;
18. The summer trimester will be more efficient in as much as students will be able to earn a semester's worth of credit as opposed to the current practice where they earn a quarter's worth of credit;
19. This proposal provides for year-round operations allowing students to complete a full academic year of instruction in 33 weeks or less;
20. The proposal still allows students to qualify for full financial aid; and

WHEREAS, There are significant features beneficial to faculty:
1. The extended term length over quarters will provide faculty with more preparation time;
2. More preparation time may facilitate a greater variety of instructional methods and strategies;
3. The condensed teaching time may allow for more time for professional development activities;
4. The proposal would give faculty additional time to pursue research and/or other professional development activities;
5. The trimester calendar is more aligned to other colleges and universities thus more opportunities may be available for sabbaticals and collaborative research, etc.;
6. The increased length of the trimester will automatically increase the length of the most commonly used one-quarter sabbatical by four to six weeks;
7. There may be a reduction in stress brought on by the intensity and demands of the current quarter system;
8. All instructional terms are equal thus course outlines remain constant;
9. There will be more time available to get to know and mentor students;
10. There will be more time proportionately spent on teaching and less time on testing;
11. There will be more time to develop ideas in class and allow students to analyze and synthesize information;
12. This proposal provides for year-round operations allowing faculty to complete a full academic year of instruction in 33 weeks or less;
13. Faculty would teach two of the three trimesters;
14. Extra compensation will be paid to faculty who teach a third trimester;
15. Terms of equal duration will permit faculty to revise curriculum into a single new format;
16. Impact on labs will be minimal; and
WHEREAS, There are significant features beneficial to administration:
1. The proposal provides for three equal and well-defined instructional periods;
2. Experience at other universities indicates that there will be lower fixed overheads regarding registration, scheduling, academic records, etc.;
3. Unit values will be compatible with other institutions thus easing articulation and speed of throughput for transfers;
4. There will be more lead time which can provide for more current/updated schedules;
5. The proposal acknowledges the need of facilities management to maintain a two-week break period between terms in order to perform necessary maintenance on campus; and

WHEREAS, There are significant features which need to be assured prior to the beginning of the change process:
1. Adjustments will be made so that progress of current students will be maintained;
2. Monies will be available/obtained by the President to finance and support administrative and faculty time and hire external contractors to address the multitude of factors inherent in a change of calendar;
3. All significant parties will be involved in the planning of these changes (the committee has contacted many parties for their ideas and opinions);
4. Adequate time will be given to plan for and implement the myriad of changes (institutions who have changed their calendaring system indicate that at least three years are required to plan for the change); therefore,

RESOLVED: That appropriate actions be initiated immediately to facilitate implementation of a tri-term calendar no later than Fall Quarter, 1997.

[*Carnegie unit: A quantification of student academic learning. 1 semester unit represents how much time a typical student is expected to devote to learning in 1 week of full-time undergraduate study (at least 40-45 hours including class time and preparation). Thus, a 6-week summer session might, if full-time, equate to 6 units. An alternative norm is 1 unit for 3 hours of student work per week (e.g., 1 hour of lecture and 2 hours of study or 3 hours of laboratory) for 10 weeks a quarter or 15 weeks a semester. A full-time undergraduate student program should normally be 14-16 units and, if full-time, no less than 12 units. (Western Association of Higher Education)]]

Proposed by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee
January 18, 1994
Academic Senate
Of
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California

Amendment to insert the following immediately after the last WHEREAS,

"Proposed by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee"
"January 18, 1994"

DELETE:  "RESOLVED, That appropriate actions be initiated immediately to facilitate implementation of a tri-term calendar no later than Fall Quarter, 1997."

AND INSERT:

WHEREAS, The present status of the State’s financial support of a Summer Quarter is less than adequate, and is not expected to change, even with the change to a Summer Term(Tri-mester) or what ever you want to call it, be it

RESOLVED: That the present structure of three regular quarters, and one summer quarter be continued. This, until a carefully structured plan of change be explored which has a timetable, a financial and a reasonable justification that, in-fact, a calendar change justifies the proposed expenditure of a great deal of faculty and staff time.

James Bernann, 20 Jan 94
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-93/
RESOLUTION ON
DEFINITIONS OF PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS,
TECHNICAL PROGRAMS, AND SIGNIFICANT MAJORITY

WHEREAS, Cal Poly is a comprehensive polytechnic university; and
WHEREAS, The "Academic Senate Response to the Cal Poly Strategic Plan" has been approved by the faculty; and
WHEREAS, The "Academic Senate Response to the Cal Poly Strategic Plan" states that, "Cal Poly shall ensure that a significant majority of Cal Poly students are enrolled in professional or technical programs"; and
WHEREAS, The character of the university, the distribution of human and fiscal resources and support services are dependent on the students enrolled in academic programs; and
WHEREAS, The university’s long-range planning is influenced by the balance among students enrolled as majors in academic programs; therefore, be it
RESOLVED: That the definition for "professional programs" shall be: Inclusion in Title 5, Section 40051 and either recognition of the program by a specialized accreditation agency or a program leading to a registration, credentialling or certification process requiring a baccalaureate degree, or both; and, be it further
RESOLVED: That the definition for "technical programs" shall be: Programs pursuing the application of knowledge derived from theoretical models of life science, physical sciences, and mathematics to create, develop, and utilize solutions to practical problems; and, be it further
RESOLVED: That the phrase "significant majority" be interpreted so that the balance between the number of student majors in technical/professional and nontechnical/professional programs at Cal Poly shall remain as it was during the period AY1988-AY1992, allowing for a similar range of variation as occurred during those five years.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee
November 2, 1993
WHEREAS, On November 3, 1992, Resolution AS-394-92/BC, "Resolution on Modification of Resolution AS-268-88/BC Entitled "Resolution on Budget Information Reporting..." was adopted by the Academic Senate and subsequently approved by President Baker for implementation; and

WHEREAS, The guidelines of this resolution set forth the type of information to be distributed to the university community; and

WHEREAS, Due to the recent changes in budget allocation, the nature of these reports needs to be changed; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Budget Committee has recommended a less extensive budget reporting format; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the attached sample format for budget reporting (Attachment A) replace Report I (Attachment B) required by Resolution AS-394-92/BC.
### Academic Affairs FY 94 Base Budget Calculations - FINAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial</strong></td>
<td>10,873,000</td>
<td>153,800</td>
<td>11,026,800</td>
<td>10,873,000</td>
<td>6,916,000</td>
<td>6,355,000</td>
<td>13,076,000</td>
<td>15,321,000</td>
<td>13,265,000</td>
<td>1,924,000</td>
<td>78,869</td>
<td>10,558,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Budget</strong></td>
<td>11,026,800</td>
<td>6,948,700</td>
<td>6,425,000</td>
<td>13,050,400</td>
<td>15,473,900</td>
<td>13,265,000</td>
<td>1,831,500</td>
<td>Salary Savings Obligation (approx. 1.6%)</td>
<td>Campus Contingency Obligation (approx. 1.2%)</td>
<td>Remaining Annuity Obligation (See Note)</td>
<td>Supplimental Allocations</td>
<td>Budget Available for Expenditure (7+8+9+10+11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permanent Budget Reduction</strong></td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final FY 94 Base Budget</strong></td>
<td>(240,000)</td>
<td>(151,500)</td>
<td>(140,000)</td>
<td>(24,500)</td>
<td>(337,500)</td>
<td>(289,000)</td>
<td>(40,000)</td>
<td>(241,468)</td>
<td>(175,439)</td>
<td>(150,399)</td>
<td>1,791,500</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary Savings Obligation</strong></td>
<td>(172,080)</td>
<td>(108,435)</td>
<td>(100,264)</td>
<td>(25,600)</td>
<td>(152,900)</td>
<td>(207,004)</td>
<td>(20,764)</td>
<td>(147,964)</td>
<td>(113,749)</td>
<td>(175,439)</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Contingency Obligation</strong></td>
<td>(78,793)</td>
<td>(72,847)</td>
<td>(152,900)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(37,471)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(113,749)</td>
<td>(113,749)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remaining Annuity Obligation</strong></td>
<td>(240,000)</td>
<td>(151,500)</td>
<td>(140,000)</td>
<td>(284,500)</td>
<td>(337,500)</td>
<td>(207,004)</td>
<td>(20,764)</td>
<td>(289,000)</td>
<td>(289,000)</td>
<td>(150,399)</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplimental Allocations</strong></td>
<td>(78,869)</td>
<td>(41,016)</td>
<td>(39,624)</td>
<td>(241,468)</td>
<td>(175,439)</td>
<td>(150,399)</td>
<td>(1,791,500)</td>
<td>(125,025)</td>
<td>(175,439)</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Available for Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>10,786,800</td>
<td>6,797,200</td>
<td>6,285,000</td>
<td>12,765,900</td>
<td>15,136,400</td>
<td>12,976,000</td>
<td>1,791,500</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Initial budget based on actions taken during FY 93.
2. Required or negotiated changes to base budgets.
3. Sum of column 1 and column 2.
4. The percent of the total that each line represents.
5. Permanent budget reduction assessed to each unit.
6. Budget reduction as a percentage of the total in column 3.
7. Final FY 94 budget after permanent reduction (Column 3 minus column 5).
8. Salary savings obligation for each unit (based on approximately 1.6% of column 7).
9. Campus contingency obligation for each unit (based on approximately 1.2% of column 7).
10. Remaining annuity obligation each unit is responsible for FY 94.
11. Supplimental allocations include telephone, postage, faculty promotion costs, and department head/chair stipends.
12. Budget available for expenditure based on the final FY 94 budget minus the various obligations plus supplimental allocations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Forecasted</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Sales:** 34,500

**Total Costs:** 9,000

**Total Profit:** 25,500
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the attached Draft Campus Policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects.

Submitted by the Academic Senate Executive Committee
December 7, 1993
To: Jack Wilson, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Robert D. Koob
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Draft Campus Policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects

Earlier this year, the Chancellor’s Office requested that each campus have in place a policy on the repatriation of Native American objects. With that directive, I asked Dr. Robert Gish, Director of Ethnic Studies, to investigate whether or not Cal Poly had an inventory of Native American skeletal materials and associated funerary objects, and to take the lead in developing a draft policy statement on this subject for the campus.

Enclosed is the draft policy developed by Dr. Gish, along with the background material from the Chancellor’s Office. I would appreciate your having the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate review this document this quarter. Questions can be answered by Dr. Gish. Thanks for your assistance in this matter.

Enclosures
August 21, 1993

TO: Robert Koob
FROM: Bob Gish
REF: Native American Burial Remains, Associated and Unassociated Funerary Objects, Sacred Objects and Cultural Patrimony. Cal Poly Policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects

COPY: Bonnie Tuohy, Robert L. Hoover

In compliance with the request from Chancellor Munitz, here is the draft policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects here at Cal Poly, SLO. This policy is proposed in conjunction with the recommendations of Professor Robert L. Hoover, Social Science Department.

Since the request for me to investigate the status of such objects on our campus originated from you, and since this proposed policy would seem to need some formal institutional adoption or approval, I submit the attached policy proposal to you.

Please feel free to discuss this proposed policy with me and with Professor Hoover.

CHRONOLOGY: (November 1993 established as deadline by Chancellor’s office)

Feb. 1993 request to CSU presidents from Chancellor
March, 1993 request to Gish received to oversee Cal Poly policy
April 8, 1993 letter from Gish to Dean Helen Roberts stating no such objects held by Cal Poly
May 7, 1993 status report to VP Academic Affairs from Interim Senior Vice Chancellor
Aug. 20, 1993 Gish sends Cal Poly draft policy report to VP Koob
Policy on Native American Skeletal Materials and Associated Funerary Objects

It is the policy of the California State University system to make a sincere effort to be responsive to the concerns of Federally recognized Native American communities and at the same time exercise responsible stewardship of archaeological collections under their supervision. It is also CSU policy that each campus develop its own procedures in dealing with requests for the repatriation of human skeletal materials and associated funerary artifacts.

As a public university in the CSU system which receives Federal funds, it is important that Cal Poly adhere to all applicable Federal laws, such as the Native American Graves Protection Act of 1990. All applicable state and local laws should also be followed, insofar as they do not conflict with Federal laws.

As an academic institution, Cal Poly is committed to procedures for repatriation that require due process and protect the rights of all parties regarding this issue.

It is NOT the policy of Cal Poly to possess or maintain Native American human skeletal material from archaeological sources. Cal Poly does not possess, nor has it ever possessed any such material. Cal Poly does not anticipate obtaining or holding any such material in the future.

Cal Poly does not possess or has it ever possessed funerary artifacts from archaeological sources. Cal Poly does not have the storage facilities to house such collections in accordance with the standards set by the Secretary of the Interior.

Cal Poly maintains a small teaching collection of artifacts, most of them collected from the surface of the ground. This collection does not include any human skeletal material or funerary artifacts and, therefore, is not subject to consideration for repatriation. Should such an eventuality occur, the following procedure shall be followed in accordance with Public Resources code:

A. Cal Poly will conduct an inventory of all its anthropological resources (archaeological, ethnographic, and physical). The anthropology faculty shall be responsible for keeping this inventory current.

B. Requests for repatriation by Federally recognized Native American groups shall be submitted directly to the University Academic Vice President and Provost in documentary form. Such requests should include evidence of cultural affinity to the materials being claimed.
1. Requests will be considered first to determine whether the claim is being made for Native American skeletal materials and funerary artifacts. If the inventory indicates that they are not in this category, they will not be subject to repatriation.

2. If the items claimed do consist of Native American skeletal materials and associated funerary artifacts, a three-person faculty/administrative committee shall be convened, consisting of an archaeologist, a Native American, and a biologist or a physical anthropologist with knowledge of human anatomy. The committee will review the request.

   a. The committee shall make a determination for or against repatriation based solely on whether the claimant has provided reasonable documentary evidence of cultural affinity to the material requested, using the principle of legal rules of evidence. If such a case has been reasonably established, repatriation will occur as soon as possible at the convenience of the claimant.

   b. If there are conflicting claims, the campus committee shall determine which group has best established closest cultural affinity to the material claimed, based on the documentation and rules of evidence.
Memorandum

Date: February 10, 1993

To: Presidents

From: Barry Munitz

Subject: Native American Burial Remains, Associated and Unassociated Funerary Objects, Sacred Objects and Cultural Patrimony

In March of 1990, the CSU provided the California Native Heritage Commission with a preliminary report on the status of campus policy and inventories regarding Native American burial remains. Since then, Federal and State laws have been enacted that require all universities to 1) prepare an inventory of these items, 2) notify the most likely descendant groups, and 3) return the remains, funerary objects, and other sacred objects, if requested to do so. According to the Federal law, institutions must complete an inventory of human remains and associated funerary objects by November of 1995, and must complete a summary of unassociated funerary objects, sacred objects, and cultural patrimony by November of 1993. Definitions and requirements are contained in the attached copy of Public Law 101-601. Proposed Federal regulations are slated to appear in the Federal Register within the next few months.

Following enactment of the Federal law, the Chancellor delegated to the campus presidents the responsibility for developing and implementing campus policy regarding collections of Native American burial remains and grave artifacts, and for negotiation of agreements with Native American communities on repatriation of these remains and artifacts.

We are now in the process of bringing our 1990 report up to date to reflect current policy statements and the status of inventory and repatriation for each of the campuses. Without this information, it is difficult to evaluate our position in meeting the requirements of the Federal and State laws.

We therefore ask that you provide the following information for your campus:

1. Does your campus have any Native American burial remains or associated funerary objects? Does your campus have any unassociated funerary objects, sacred objects, or cultural patrimony?
2. Please submit a copy of your current campus policy regarding Native American burial remains and objects. If you have not yet developed a policy, please submit the timeline and expected date of completion for the policy.

Note: A campus having no such items need not develop a policy, but should ensure that campus personnel comply fully with all relevant federal and state laws, including Public Resources Code 5097.98, in any new excavations or acquisitions.

3. What is the status of your campus inventory of these items? Please provide a brief description of the remains, artifacts, or collections that are included in your inventory. If the inventory is not complete, what is the timeline and expected completion date for the inventory?

4. Has your campus returned any human remains or objects to Native American communities? Please provide a brief description of the items, the name of the Native American community, and the date returned.

Send your response to the attention of Dr. Helen Roberts, State University Dean, Academic Affairs/Research and Development, CSU Office of the Chancellor, 400 Golden Shore, Suite 132, Long Beach, California 90802-4275, by April 1, 1993. Questions may be directed to Dr. Roberts at (310) 985-2607. For questions about the Federal law or to receive a copy of the proposed regulations, contact Dr. Tim McKeown, Archaeological Assistance Division, National Park Service, at (202) 343-1142. For questions about the California law or identification of California Indian descendant groups, contact Mr. Larry Myers, Executive Secretary of the California Native Heritage Commission at (916) 653-4082.


Distribution:
Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
Members, Native American Advisory Committee
Date: November 16, 1990

To: Presidents

From: Ellis E. McCune
Acting Chancellor

Subject: Native American Burial Remains and Associated Grave Artifacts

In September of 1989, the executive secretary of the California Native American Heritage Commission wrote to this office requesting information regarding CSU collections of Native American remains and associated grave artifacts and the status of our policy on this matter. We asked the vice presidents for academic affairs to provide this information for the campuses, and in March of 1990, we sent the attached status report to the Native American Heritage Commission.

There is existing federal legislation which requires the Smithsonian Institution to return Indian skeletal remains and burial artifacts to the most likely descendant group, and a second federal law has been introduced that would require all museums to return Indian remains, sacred and ceremonial objects, and religious objects to their groups of origin.

We have also been following Assembly Bill 2577 which passed the California Legislature this year but was vetoed by the Governor. AB 2577, introduced by Assembly Member Katz, would require public and private agencies and persons who possess Native American remains or associated grave artifacts to compile and forward to the Native American Heritage Commission a copy of their archaeological record or other specific information concerning the remains, and to return the remains to the most likely descendants if requested. The probability is that Assembly Member Katz will reintroduce this bill in the next session.

The California Native Heritage Commission is the legislatively established state agency responsible for identifying and inventorying sacred lands, burial sites, and sacred objects in order to preserve the cultural and religious heritage of California. The Native Heritage Commission's responsibilities and authority are described in Health and Safety Code 7050.5 and Public Resources Code 5097.94.
The President of each CSU campus is delegated the responsibility for developing and implementing campus policy regarding collections of Native American skeletal remains and associated grave artifacts. The campus president is also delegated the authority and responsibility for negotiation of agreements with Native American communities and the California Native American Heritage Commission regarding repatriation of campus collections of Native American skeletal remains and associated grave artifacts.

Many universities and museums across the country are developing policy and procedures for the repatriation of Native American remains. Stanford University has established a policy which has been provided as an example by the Native American Heritage Commission. CSU, Chico has just completed development of their university policy, and the University of California convened a committee which has studied the issues and made a series of recommendations to the President's Office. Although the Smithsonian Institution has not yet finalized its internal policy and procedures, the requirements of the federal legislation (attached) are very explicit.

We recommend that you take the following steps to ensure that your campus is in full compliance with state and federal law on this matter:

1. Consult with appropriate Native American communities and constituencies.
2. Develop and/or review campus policy regarding collections of Native American skeletal remains and associated grave artifacts.
3. Develop and/or review written procedures to guide campus and community groups in handling requests for repatriation of collections.
4. Communicate campus policy and procedures to the faculty, the community, and the California Native American Heritage Commission.
5. Continue inventory and analysis of Native American burial remains and associated grave artifacts as policy deliberations proceed.

A campus having no Native American burial remains or associated grave artifacts need not develop a policy or procedures, but should ensure that campus personnel comply fully with Public Resources Code 5097.98 in any new excavations or acquisitions.

Attached for your information are copies of: 1) the federal legislation requiring the Smithsonian Institution to repatriate Native American remains, 2) AB 2577, the Katz bill (as amended) which passed the California legislature before being vetoed by the Governor, 3) Stanford University's policy regarding repatriation, 4) CSU, Chico's policy regarding repatriation, 5) recommendations of the University of California committee, 6) status report submitted by CSU to the Native American Heritage Commission, 7) Health and Safety Code 7050 and 8) Public Resources Code 5097.

enclosures
WHEREAS, The future of California is directly tied to meeting the educational needs of the next generation; and

WHEREAS, The demand for higher education is increasing beyond the present limits of the CSU to accommodate; and

WHEREAS, A principal objective of telecommunications is to provide instructional experiences to students, to accommodate explosive enrollment growth, and to meet the educational and manpower needs of the next generation; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate supports advancements in teaching technologies and encourages new and innovative models and methods of teaching; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate is the formal policy-recommending body in matters of curriculum and academic standards; and

WHEREAS, The curriculum is the responsibility of the faculty; and

WHEREAS, The use of emerging information technologies will require development of appropriate pedagogies; and

WHEREAS, The employment of emerging information technologies has significant implications for curriculum and academic standards; and

WHEREAS, The technology has not been proven as an effective educational tool; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That courses offered for academic credit through telecommunications media be treated as new courses and appropriate course proposal be submitted to the Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate for customary review and approval; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate instruct its Chair to remind the administration of the Academic Senate's responsibility in matters affecting curriculum, and academic standards.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee
January 11, 1994
Background Statement: Throughout the last several years, criticism has been received informally that the existing Code of Ethics is awkwardly written and lacks the force of law in that it does not appear in the Campus Administrative Manual.

During spring 1993, interested members of the Personnel Policies Committee worked on revising the existing Code to remove the awkward "he/she" phraseology, make the Code gender-neutral, and thereby make it more readable and meaningful.

Due to the illness of the committee chair (in April 1993) and the reluctance of a majority of the members of the committee to meet in May 1993, work on the revised Code was not completed. By a memo dated October 25, 1993, Jack Wilson referred the matter to us once again for formal consideration.

By a vote of 6-0-0, the Personnel Policies Committee endorsed the resolution/document which follows. For your ease of reading, please note: Attachment 1 is the existing Faculty Code of Ethics and Attachment 2 is the revised Faculty Code of Ethics (with optional headings). Please choose which you prefer.

WHEREAS, The original Faculty Code of Ethics was taken from an earlier document and redrafted to remove reference to male gender; and

WHEREAS, The present "he/she" format is difficult to read; and

WHEREAS, The present Faculty Code of Ethics appears on pages 1 and 2 of the Faculty Handbook; and

WHEREAS, Official campus policy should be included in the Campus Administrative Manual; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Code of Ethics shall be rewritten in gender-neutral language as indicated on the attached page; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the revised Faculty Code of Ethics shall be included in the Campus Administrative Manual as CAM 370.TBD.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
February 16, 1994
FACULTY CODE OF ETHICS

The following Faculty Code of Ethics was developed by the Academic Senate and approved by the President:

The professor, guided by a deep conviction of worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge recognizes the special responsibilities placed upon him/her. His/her primary responsibility to his/her subject is to seek and state the truth as he/she sees it. To this end, he/she devotes his/her energies to developing and improving his/her scholarly competence. He/she accepts the obligation to exercise self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. He/she practices intellectual honesty. Although he/she may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise his/her freedom of inquiry.

As a teacher, the professor encourages the free pursuit of learning in his/her students. He/she holds before them the best scholarly standards of his/her discipline. He/she demonstrates respect for the student as an individual, and adheres to his/her proper role as intellectual guide and counselor. He/she makes every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that his/her evaluation of students reflects their true merit. He/she respects the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. He/she avoids any exploitation of students for his/her private advantage and acknowledges significant assistance from them. He/she protects their academic freedom.

As a colleague, the professor has obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. He/she respects and defends the free inquiry of his/her associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas, he/she shows due respect for the opinions of others. He/she acknowledges his/her academic debts and strives to be objective in his/her professional judgment of colleagues. He/she accepts his/her share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of his/her institution.

As a member of his/her institution, the professor seeks, above all, to be an effective teacher and scholar. Although he/she observes the stated regulations of the institution, provided they do not contravene academic freedom, he/she maintains his/her right to criticize and seek revision. He/she determines the amount and character of the work he/she does outside his/her institution with due regard to his/her paramount responsibilities within it. When considering the interruption or termination of his/her service, he/she recognizes the effect of his/her decision upon the program of the institution and gives due notice of his/her intentions.

As a member of his/her community, the professor has the rights and obligations of any citizen. He/she measures the urgency of these obligations in the light of his/her responsibilities to his/her subject, to his/her students, to his/her profession, and to his/her institution. When he/she speaks or acts as a private person he/she avoids creating the impression that he/she speaks or acts for his/her college or university. As a citizen engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, the professor has a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.
(Working draft of the revised)

FACULTY CODE OF ETHICS

As scholars:
Professors are guided by a conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge. They recognize special responsibilities to seek and state the truth in a given subject matter and to develop and improve scholarly competence. The faculty member also recognizes an obligation to exercise self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge and to practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, such interests should not compromise freedom of inquiry.

As teachers:
Professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students, while upholding the best scholarly standards of the discipline. Professors should also foster honest academic conduct and assure the honest evaluation of students. Professors should also respect the confidential nature of the student-professor relationship, should avoid the exploitation of students for private advantage, should acknowledge significant assistance from students, and should protect the student's academic freedom.

As colleagues:
Professors have obligations deriving from common membership in the community of scholars. They respect and defend free inquiry and respect the opinions of others. The faculty member [acknowledges academic debts and] strives to be objective in the evaluation of colleagues. Each faculty member should also accept an appropriate share of responsibility for the governance of the academic institution.

As members of the university community:
Professors seek to be effective teachers. Although professors should observe all regulations of the university which do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain the right to criticize and seek revision of such regulations. Each professor should subordinate the amount and character of work done outside the university to their paramount responsibility within it. When deciding to terminate employment, the faculty member should recognize the effect of that decision upon the institutional programs and give reasonable notice of the intention to leave.

As members of the larger community:
Professors have the same rights and obligations as any other citizen. Such rights and obligations are subject to certain responsibilities to the university. Faculty members who are speaking or acting as private citizens should avoid creating the impression that they are speaking for the 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.
Background Statement: By a memo dated September 21, 1993, the Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force referred to the Personnel Policies Committee a Diversity Proposal for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure. In that proposal two statements were made: (1) "The purpose of this proposal is not to be punitive, but to facilitate faculty awareness and involvement in this important issue"; (2) "It is proposed that within each area, diversity-related activities be specifically noted. It is not intended that faculty must fulfill diversity requirements in all three categories. However, diversity-related activities should appear in at least one category."

The Personnel Policies Committee believes that these two statements are contradictory. We agree with the first statement above and, hence, propose that Form 109 be revised so as to permit specific mention of diversity-related activities.

The Committee is opposed to any diversity-requirement in Retention, Promotion, and Tenure.

For ease of reading, please note: Attachment 1 is one way to revise Form 109 to include specific mention of diversity-related activities; Attachment 2 is a second way to accomplish the same result; and Attachment 3 is the Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force's Diversity Proposal for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure and the accompanying letter of transmittal.

WHEREAS, The University is committed to diversity; and

WHEREAS, Faculty members are encouraged to become more involved in promoting diversity; and

WHEREAS, Diversity is broadly defined in terms of "differences in age, country of origin, creed, economic background, ethnicity, gender, physical disability, race, and sexual orientation" (Education Equity Commission, 1992); and

WHEREAS, Diversity-related activities permeate the existing areas of teaching, scholarship and University/community service in which tenure-track faculty are required to show competence; and

WHEREAS The Cal Poly Equal Opportunity Advisory Council has proposed that diversity considerations become an integral part of the retention, promotion and tenure (RPT) process; and

WHEREAS, Form 109 does not preclude mention of diversity-related activities; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force has endorsed the Equal Opportunity Advisory Council's proposal; therefore, be it...
RESOLUTION ON DIVERSITY PROPOSAL
FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
AS- -94/PPC

RESOLVED: That Form 109 be revised so as to include diversity-related activities as a specific factor of consideration; and

RESOLVED: That faculty members be recognized for the pursuit of diversity-related activities.

Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
February 16, 1994
FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

NAME____________________________ FACULTY RANK/STEP____________________________

DEPARTMENT____________________________ SCHOOL____________________________ DATE____________________________

This is an evaluation for (check applicable blank or blanks):

Retention to a ___1st, ___2nd, ___3rd, ___4th, ___5th, ___6th probationary year.

___ Tenure

___ Merit Salary Increase

___ Promotion

___ Other

___ Periodic Review

FACTORS OF CONSIDERATION

Justification for Recommendations (CAM 341.1.D)
Evaluative statements should be accompanied by supporting evidence. If the evidence does not appear to support the recommendations made, the file will be returned to the reviewing levels for amplification.

The evaluator should review effectiveness of the faculty member primarily during this evaluation period. The evaluation should reflect both (1) evidence of merit and (2) suggested areas for improvement. Reference any resources used for evaluation; such as class visitation, conferences, and materials provided by the faculty member. If more space is needed, use an additional page.

I. Teaching Performance and/or Other Professional Performance: Consider such factors as the faculty member's competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of course, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student consultations, and other factors relating to performance as a teacher, including diversity-related activities. (Include results of Student Evaluation Program.)

Evidence of Merit:

*Non-teaching academic personnel are to be evaluated on their professional performance.
(Teaching Performance and/or Other Professional Performance, cont.)

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

II. **Professional Growth and Achievement:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's original preparation and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies and publications, professional registration, certification and licensing, and diversity-related activities.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:
III. Service to University and Community: Consider such factors as the faculty member's participation in academic advisement, placement follow-up, cocurricular activities, department, school and university committee and individual assignments, systemwide assignments, and service in community affairs directly related to the faculty member's teaching area, as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities, including diversity-related activities.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

IV. Other Factors of Consideration: Consider such factors as the faculty member's ability to relate with colleagues, initiative, cooperativeness, dependability, and health, etc.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:
FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

NAME______________________ FACULTY RANK/STEP____________________

DEPARTMENT____________________ SCHOOL____________________ DATE__________

This is an evaluation for (check applicable blank or blanks):

Retention to a ____1st, ____2nd, ____3rd, ____4th, ____5th, ____6th probationary year.

____ Tenure __________ Merit Salary Increase

____ Promotion __________ Other

____ Periodic Review

FACTORs OF CONSIDERATION

Justification for Recommendations (CAM 341.1, D)
Evaluative statements should be accompanied by supporting evidence. If the evidence does not appear to support the recommendations made, the file will be returned to the reviewing levels for amplification.

The evaluator should review effectiveness of the faculty member primarily during this evaluation period. The evaluation should reflect both (1) evidence of merit and (2) suggested areas for improvement. Reference any resources used for evaluation; such as class visitation, conferences, and materials provided by the faculty member. If more space is needed, use an additional page.

*I. Teaching Performance and/or Other Professional Performance: Consider such factors as the faculty member's competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of course, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student consultations, and other factors relating to performance as a teacher. (Include results of Student Evaluation Program.)

Evidence of Merit:

*Nonteaching academic personnel are to be evaluated on their professional performance.
II. **Professional Growth and Achievement**: Consider such factors as the faculty member's original preparation and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies and publications, professional registration, certification, and licensing.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:
III. **Service to University and Community:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's participation in academic advisement, placement follow-up, cocurricular activities, department, school and university committee and individual assignments, systemwide assignments, and service in community affairs directly related to the faculty member's teaching area, as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

IV. **Other Factors of Consideration:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's ability to relate with colleagues and students (including diversity-related activities), initiative, cooperativeness, dependability, and health, etc.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:
MEMORANDUM

Date: September 21, 1993

To: Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee

From: Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force
(Mary Beth Armstrong, Kezia Brown, Lawson Bush, David Dubbin, Philip Fetzer, Victor Fonseca, Monet Parham, Refugio Rodriguez)

Subject: Diversity Proposal for RPT

During this past summer, the Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force met to draft various resolutions that would further the achievement of diversity goals at Cal Poly. After reviewing the Equal Opportunity Advisory Committee's Diversity Proposal for RPT, we wanted to acknowledge our support for its recommendations and add the following:

1. We ask that the Diversity Proposal for RPT be addressed as soon as possible;

2. We recommend that some wording be added to indicate that, without changing the Strategic Plan definition of Diversity, we would like to see special emphasis placed on African-Americans, Latino-Americans, and Native-Americans.

Thank you for your consideration of these items. If you have any questions regarding our committee or the comments given above, please contact Margaret (1258) at the Academic Senate office.
Diversity Proposal for RPT

To enhance the University's commitment to diversity and to encourage faculty to become more involved, the EOAC proposes that diversity considerations become an integral part of the retention, promotion and tenure (RPT) process. Currently, faculty are asked to show competence in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and University or community service. It is proposed that within each area, diversity-related activities be specifically noted. It is not intended that faculty must fulfill diversity requirements in all three categories. However, diversity-related activities should appear in at least one category.

Diversity, in this context is defined in terms of "differences in age, country of origin, creed, economic background, ethnicity, gender, physical disability, race, and sexual orientation" (Educational Equity Commission, 1992). Diversity-related activities encompass any activities (broadly defined) included within the three areas of RPT consideration (i.e., teaching, scholarship, and University or community service). For example, if one adds materials related to diversity into lectures or teaches a course dealing with diversity, this would be a diversity-related, teaching activity. Scholarship would include research on diversity topics, attending diversity-related conferences/workshops, making presentations at such conferences/workshops, and similar activities. University or community service would include serving on committees associated with diversity, volunteering for organizations that are diversity related, etc. In essence, the definition of what types of activities fit within each of the three categories of evaluation is to be broadly defined.

The purpose of this proposal is not to be punitive, but to facilitate faculty awareness and involvement in this important issue. Because the omission of information dealing with diversity is an omission of knowledge itself, such activity should lead to better teaching, better scholarship and, in the greater humanity for both faculty and students alike.
General Education and Breadth Proposal

1. PROPOSER'S NAME
   Steven Marx

2. PROPOSER'S DEPARTMENT
   English

3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)
   C.3

4. THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR:
   - [ ] New Course
   - [ ] Change to an Existing GEB Course
   - [X] Existing Course Proposed for Addition to GEB

5. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION (follow catalog format)
   ENGL 355 The Bible as Literature (3)
   Old and New Testaments with historical background. Literary forms and characteristics of Hebraic writing. Appreciation of the far-reaching use of Biblical narrative and reference in literature, speeches, art, drama, and modern film. 3 lectures. Prerequisite: ENGL 114 or equivalent or consent of instructor.

6. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS
   The Area C subcommittee unanimously approved the attached proposal for English 355, The Bible as Literature.
   [Signature]
   Chair

7. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMARKS
   Approval recommended (3/3/94). This course fully meets the criteria for inclusion as a C.3 geb course.

8. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION

Academic Programs: 7/18/90
## General Education and Breadth Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>2. PROPOSER'S DEPARTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Velasquez</td>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X New Course (approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Change to an Existing GEB Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Existing Course Proposed for Addition to GEB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION (follow catalog format) |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| SPAN 340                        | Chicano/a Authors (4) |

To introduce students to Chicano/a literary accomplishments in order to facilitate their appreciation of Chicano/a literary aesthetics and to increase their understanding of Chicano/a cultural values and lifestyles. Lecture in Spanish. 4 units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee approval recommended (12/3/93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This course should have been evaluated by our committee last year; it fell through the cracks in the review process. This course fully meets the criteria for inclusion on the C.3 GEB list of courses. Approval recommended (3/3/94).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Academic Programs: 7/18/90
1. PROPOSER'S NAME
   Mike Blum

2. PROPOSER'S DEPARTMENT
   Graphic Communication

3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)
   F.1

4. THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR:
   - New Course
   - Change to an Existing GEB Course
   - Existing Course Proposed for Addition to GEB

5. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION (follow catalog format)
   GrC 277 Computer Applications in Desktop Publishing (3)
   Computer applications, their relationship to print media and publishing. How desktop publishing is influencing and is influenced by society. Use and selection of personal computers, desktop publishing software, and output devices. Terminology, typography, creating, editing, transferring, merging text and graphics. Credit not allowed for GrC majors. Miscellaneous course fee requires—See Class Schedule. 2 lectures, 1 laboratory.

6. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS
   Approval recommended February 18, 1994; reservations expressed about resources needed to meet student demand and how often this course will be offered.

7. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMARKS
   The GEB Committee recommends approval of this course (3/3/94). We note the concerns of the Area F Subcommittee. These need to be addressed. However, the content of this course meets the criteria for inclusion on the F.1 list.

8. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION

Academic Programs: 7/18/90
Statement on Professional Ethics

The statement that follows, a revision of a statement originally adopted in 1966, was approved by Committee B on Professional Ethics, adopted by the Council as Association policy, and endorsed by the Seventy-third Annual Meeting in June 1987.

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 professors in such matters as their utterances as citizens, the exercise of their responsibilities to students and colleagues, and their conduct when resigning from an institution or when undertaking sponsored research. The Statement on Professional Ethics that follows sets forth those general standards that serve as a reminder of the variety of responsibilities 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 provides this assurance and so should normally handle questions concerning propriety of conduct within its own framework by reference to a faculty group. The Association supports such local action and stands ready, through the general secretary and Committee B, to counsel with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire into complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of adverse action, the procedures should be in accordance with the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings, or the applicable provisions of the Association's Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

THE STATEMENT

I. 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.

II. 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 students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. 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.

III. 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 acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

IV. 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, 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.

V. 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 private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting 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.
# CALENDAR ISSUE FACTS

## Calendar System Time Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar System</th>
<th>Standard Lecture Unit</th>
<th>Length of Term</th>
<th>Vacation Days</th>
<th>Calendar Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current four quarter</td>
<td>50 minutes</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
<td>26 days</td>
<td>Sept. 19 - June 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester w/summer (s)</td>
<td>50 minutes</td>
<td>15 weeks</td>
<td>37 days</td>
<td>August 29 - April 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quarter System
- Permits two or three unit courses with concentration on a single theme.
- Permits student employment through traditional end of summer (Labor Day Weekend).
- Three opportunities attend courses. Dropping or failing a course would mean losing a 1/3 of a year compared to a 1/2 year.
- More opportunities for students to transfer to Cal Poly.
- Larger variety of courses available
- Exposure to greater number of faculty
- More Courses required for graduation

### Semester System
- Fewer final examination, registration, etc.
- Provide a longer period of time for new/transfer students to adjust to Cal Poly
- Facilitate easier coordination with school districts for student-teacher assignments
- Earlier entrance to summer employment
- One-half year Coops available
- Semesters coincide with 102 of 107 community colleges
- Lower fixed overhead in regards to campus wide administration processes such as scheduling, academic records functions and financial aid

**Year round courses are NOT MANDATORY in either of the two choices**

**Length of term also consist of an additional 1 week of exams**

**Ballot wording:**
As a concerned student, with an invested interest in the future of my education, I prefer the following calendar system:

- Current four quarter system
- Semester with summer session (s)