I. Minutes: Approval of the Academic Senate minutes for April 12, 1994 (p. 2).

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

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):
   B. Resolution on Campus Policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects—Gish, Director for Ethnic Studies, first reading (pp. 30-38 of your 4/12/94 agenda).
   C. Resolution on Revision of the Faculty Code of Ethics—Terry, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, first reading (pp. 40-42 of your 4/12/94 agenda).
   D. Resolution on Diversity Proposal for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure—Terry, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, first reading (pp. 43-52 of your 4/12/94 agenda).
   E. GE&B proposals for ENGL 355, SPAN 340, and GRC 277—Vilkitis, Co-Chair of the GE&B Committee, first reading (pp. 53-55 of your 4/12/94 agenda).
   F. Resolution on Indirect Cost Sharing for ARDFA—Krieger, Chair of the Research Committee, first reading (p. 3-10).
   G. Resolution on Five-year Academic Program Review Schedule—Heidersbach, Chair of the Program Review and Improvement Committee, first reading (pp. 11-13).
   H. Resolution on Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines Change—Heidersbach, Chair of the Program Review and Improvement Committee, first reading (pp. 14-19).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
State of California Memorandum
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

To: Jack Wilson, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Dan Krieger, Chair, ASRC

CC: Susan Opava

Date: April 21, 1994

Subject: Sunsetting of "Experimental Agreement for Indirect Cost Sharing for ARDFA Sponsored Projects"

Attachments: ADMINISTRATIVE BULLETIN 90-2

THE PROBLEM:

ADMINISTRATIVE BULLETIN 90-2 created an experimental model for stimulating the development of infrastructure for research at CAL POLY. It sets procedures for five years, beginning with Academic Year 1989-90.

The ASRC is charged with annually reviewing the ARDFA facility created by the bulletin. The five year period has drawn to a close. The question of continuance or sunsetting the arrangement is at hand. Herewith is the ASRC evaluation of the ARDFA experiment:

A BRIEF HISTORY OF ARDFA's ORIGINS:

Robert Lucas, then Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research and Faculty Development, had begun the task of remodeling a World War II era aircraft hangar now designated as Building 04.

Prof. Steve Hockaday (College of Engineering) became interested in converting the hangar into a facility for his CALTRANS funded transportation engineering projects.

The problem of paying for this development of infrastructure for research became critical.
Lucas and Hockaday perceived the rate of recovery of indirect costs as a source of generating the needed funds.

ADMINISTRATIVE BULLETIN 90-2 describes the procedures for allocating indirect costs earned on selected sponsored projects to the newly created Applied Research and Development Facility and Activities (ARDFA).

The bulletin notes that the "procedures are proposed as an experiment for applied research facilities that do not have general fund or other continuing sources of support for their basic operation."

It describes the problem of recovery of indirect costs at this University:

The Campus Administrative Manual (Section 543) describes the policy of sharing indirect costs earned on sponsored projects. Current policy does not allocate indirect costs for items such as general equipment purchase, maintenance and operating costs. Such use is appropriate in general circumstances, however, since capital costs and operating expenses comprise part of the indirect cost rate. The cost principles of the Federal Government's Department of Health and Human Services, as expressed in the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-21, allow costs of operation (lighting, heating, janitorial), furnishing, remodeling, equipment installation and maintenance, office equipment, departmental administration and management as part of the base that makes up the indirect cost rate.

The bulletin then creates an exception to campus policies:

"This administrative bulletin creates an administrative exception to CAM 543 as an experiment for Building 04. It describes a way to return part of the indirect costs to support the continued development and operation of a research facility. It will serve until a policy governing all such facilities is recommended and adopted in the Campus Administrative Manual."

The bulletin then sets the following "Policies and Procedures":

For five years, beginning with Academic Year 1989-90, the following procedures will apply:

Projects conducted in Building 04 that have specific need for remodeling or for the installation of equipment shall, whenever possible, recover these costs as line items in the budget of the grant or contract. When direct cost recovery is not possible, the cost of remodeling or installing equipment may be drawn from the development and operating budget of ARDFA.
Indirect costs earned on ARDFA/IC projects shall be allocated among the following program areas, following a percentage recommended by the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development and approved by the President in the Fall of each academic year:

a) ARDFA facility development, operating costs, and reserves;

b) Foundation costs, consisting of Sponsored Programs administrative costs and reserves;

c) University research development costs, including Grants Development Office costs and reserves, and

d) The CARE grant program of the Academic Senate Research Committee.

The bulletin stipulates that the percentages of recovery of indirect costs be set only after the submission of an annual report by the Associate Vice President for Research that would include a proposal for a specific level for recouping such costs.

This report was to be reviewed by "the ARDFA Director, the Academic Senate Research Committee, the Director of the Grants Development Office and the Director of Sponsored Programs before being via the Vice President for Academic Affairs to the President for approval before the end of the Fall Quarter."

The bulletin set the maximum percentage of recovery for ARDFA indirect costs at forty-percent (40%). It notes that the recovery rates for Foundation Sponsored Programs is 44%, but for Grants Development it is a slim 11% and for CARE Grants it is 5%.

CONCLUSIONS:

The ASRC congratulates Prof. Hockaday and the ARDFA staff for their energies and very real accomplishments in promoting research during the worst fiscal crisis since the Great Depression.

Nonetheless, the ASRC believes that the procedures set forth in Administrative Bulletin 90-2 have not been followed in granting maximum rate (40%) of recovery of indirect costs to ARDFA. The ARDFA experiment has resulted in inequities for the
other institutes and centers generating indirect costs. Hence the ARDFA model does not benefit or stimulate research activities throughout the academic community.

The ASRC recommends that ARDFA be granted the same rate of recovery of indirect costs as other centers and institutes.

The ASRC also recommends that the Senate charge our committee with fulfilling the goal of Administrative Bulletin 90-2: The University desperately needs a policy for equitably funding infrastructure for research by centers and institutes at the University.
The attached procedures to implement a trial policy for indirect cost sharing for the Applied Research and Development Facility and Activities (ARDFA) was developed after recommendation by the Academic Senate. This administrative bulletin creates an administrative exception to the manner in which indirect cost funds are distributed and implements the procedures during the five year trial period beginning with Academic Year 1989-90.

NOTE: This Administrative Bulletin should be filed in the Appendix of the Campus Administrative Manual and appropriate entries made in the CAM Index and Administrative Bulletins list.
INDIRECT COSTS SHARING FOR ARDFA SPONSORED PROJECTS

This bulletin describes procedures for allocating indirect costs earned on selected sponsored projects to the Applied Research and Development Facility and Activities (ARDFA). The procedures are proposed as an experiment for applied research facilities that do not have general fund or other continuing sources of support for their basic operation.

The Campus Administrative Manual (Section 543) describes the policy of sharing indirect costs earned on sponsored projects. Current policy does not allocate indirect costs for items such as general equipment purchase, maintenance and operating costs. Such use is appropriate in general circumstances, however, since capital costs and operating expenses comprise part of the indirect cost rate. The cost principles of the Federal Government's Department of Health and Human Services, as expressed in the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-21, allow costs of operation (lighting, heating, janitorial), furnishing, remodeling, equipment installation and maintenance, office equipment, departmental administration and management as part of the base that makes up the indirect cost rate.

This administrative bulletin creates an administrative exception to CAM 543 as an experiment for Building 04. It describes a way to return a portion of the indirect costs to support the continued development and operation of a research facility. It will serve until a policy governing all such facilities is recommended and adopted in the Campus Administrative Manual.

These guidelines apply to the sharing of indirect costs recovered only on those projects conducted exclusively in Building 04 as part of ARDFA. In practice, this means that a project situated administratively in an instructional office on campus, but conducted in a laboratory in Building 04, is governed by these guidelines. Conversely, a project run in a laboratory which is not in Building 04 is not an ARDFA project even if it is administered from an office in Building 04. In the latter case, the indirect costs are treated the same as if they were earned on any other research project.

Sponsored research projects that meet the criterion for being included in this experiment will be identified as ARDFA/IC projects. This designation will be noted on the "Approval of Application for Grant or Contract" Form that is routed with any proposal before it leaves campus. The notes section of the approval form will contain a statement which reads:

This proposal is for an ARDFA/IC project, to be conducted exclusively in Building 04. Indirect costs will be shared in accordance with Administrative Bulletin 90-2.
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

For five years, beginning with Academic Year 1989-90, the following procedures will apply:

Projects conducted in Building 04 that have specific need for remodeling or for the installation of equipment shall, whenever possible, recover these costs as line items in the budget of the grant or contract. When direct cost recovery is not possible, the cost of remodeling or installing equipment may be drawn from the development and operating budget of ARDFA.

1. Indirect costs earned on ARDFA/IC projects shall be allocated among the following program areas, following a percentage recommended by the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development and approved by the President in the Fall of each academic year:

   a) ARDFA facility development, operating costs, and reserves;
   b) Foundation costs, consisting of Sponsored Programs administrative costs and reserves;
   c) University research development costs, including Grants Development Office costs and reserves, and
   d) The CARE grant program of the Academic Senate Research Committee.

2. The percentages to be recommended shall be set as follows:

   a) Following the end of each fiscal year, the ARDFA Director shall prepare a report that describes ARDFA/IC projects, provides actual income and expenses for the previous academic year and gives estimates of income and costs for building development and operation for the next academic year. The director shall develop this report in consultation with the Dean of the School of Engineering, and shall send it to the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development before the beginning of the Fall Quarter.

   b) The Associate Vice President shall prepare a report that combines the ARDFA report with data on income and costs in the previous fiscal year for Sponsored Programs administration, Grants Development administration and CARE grants. The report shall include a proposal that recommends the ARDFA percentage to be adopted for the current academic year. The maximum percentage for ARDFA/IC projects shall be 40%.
The proposal shall be incorporated into the annual report on proposed indirect costs utilization described in CAM 543 and will be reviewed by the ARDFA Director, the Academic Senate Research Committee, the Director of the Grants Development Office and the Director of Sponsored Programs before being sent via the Vice President for Academic Affairs to the President for approval before the end of the Fall Quarter.

3. The President shall set the ARDFA/IC percentage before the start of the Winter Quarter. The Foundation shall deposit funds monthly into the ARDFA Foundation account from indirect costs earned and received on ARDFA/IC projects as reimbursement is recovered from the sponsor.

4. The Academic Senate Research Committee may conduct an independent review of ARDFA each Spring Quarter and prepare a report for the President's review. Copies of the report shall be provided to the ARDFA Director, the Associate Vice President and the Director of Sponsored Programs.

Percentages for AY 1989-90, the first year of this experiment, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARDFA/IC Projects (maximum)</th>
<th>40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Sponsored Programs</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants Development</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE Grants/ASRC</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current projects and proposals covered as ARDFA/IC projects under this administrative bulletin shall be identified by the ARDFA Director. A list of these projects shall be sent to each department head to acknowledge their governance under the provisions of this administrative bulletin.

APPROVED: Warren J. Baker, President

DATE: August 28, 1990
WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee has proposed a five-year academic program review schedule for all academic programs at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, The proposed five-year academic program review schedule has been discussed within each college; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the attached "1994 Degree Program Summary" prepared by the Program Review and Improvement Committee be approved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS Agricultural Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Agricultural Engineering, Ag Eng Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Agricultural Science, Agricultural Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Animal Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Crop Science, Plant Protection Science, Fruit Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Dairy Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Food Science, Nutritional Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Forestry and Natural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Recreation Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Ornamental Horticulture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Soil Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS Architectural Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARCH/MS Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS/MS MCRP City and Regional Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Construction Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLA Landscape Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCRP/MS Transportation Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS/MBA Business Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA/MS Engineering Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS/MA Industrial Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS/MS Biological Sciences, Biochemistry, Ecology and Systemic Biology, Microbiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS/MS Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS/MS Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Physics, Physical Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS/MS</td>
<td>Civil Engineering/Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS/MS</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS/MS</td>
<td>Electrical/Electronic Engineering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Engineering Science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Manufacturing Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Materials Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA/MS</td>
<td>Engineering Management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCRP/MS</td>
<td>Transportation Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Applied Art and Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/MA</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Graphic Communication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS/MS</td>
<td>Psychology/Human Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Speech Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR TEACHER EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WHEREAS, The guidelines for the Program Review and Improvement Committee set forth broad criteria for reviewing programs; and

WHEREAS, Some of the material in the existing guidelines does not provide enough information to justify the effort required to gather and submit it; and

WHEREAS, Asking programs to submit all the material in the guidelines makes the compilation of documents, and their review, burdensome; and

WHEREAS, The existing guidelines are on some subjects vague and ambiguous requiring flexibility on the part of the committee; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Program Review and Improvement Committee have the flexibility to decide what information within the existing guidelines will best serve the interests of the university community; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Program Review and Improvement Committee recommend changes in procedure, if any, as a standard component of their annual report.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee
April 19, 1994
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT GUIDELINES

[*Indicates data to be provided by the Institutional Studies Office*]

I. MISSION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

A. Relevance of the program to the special mission of Cal Poly and/or the mission of the CSU:

   See Attachment A - Title 5 description of Subchapter 2 "Educational Program", Articles 1 and 2; Attachment B - Mission Statement of the California State University; and Attachment C - Cal Poly's Mission Statement.

B. Evidence that the program mission, goals, and objectives are being met:

   List the program mission, goals, and objectives. Include your departmental priorities. See Attachment D - list of examples of instructional priorities for reference.

C. Contribution to the community, state, and nation:

   In what general ways does the program contribute to each of these? Are the graduates of particular service?

II. PROGRAM QUALITY

A. Curriculum:

1. Appropriate sequence, patterns of delivery, and size of class:

   Using data provided by Institutional Studies, identify low/over-enrollment courses and explain circumstances for each. Low enrollment courses, as defined by Administrative Bulletin 82-1, are courses with less than 13 students for lower division, less than 10 students for upper division, less than 5 students for graduate courses, and frequency of offering of these courses for the last two years. Identify graduate courses with high undergraduate enrollment and explain circumstances for each one. Describe structure of curriculum including actual or possible course taking sequences and patterns (demonstrate with flow chart).

   What other programs on campus have an impact on the ability of your students to graduate on time?

2. Appropriate comparison with similar peer programs:

   Summarize and compare with identical or similar programs.

3. Appropriate course mix related to previously stated goals and objectives:

   Do your course offerings meet the stated goals and objectives of your department?

   List all major concentrations currently offered and specify the number of students enrolled in each.

4. Quality evaluation method:

   Provide information on how your program is evaluated by the appropriate means including one or more of the following methods:

   a. accreditation:

      Indicate if accreditation agencies exist for your program evaluation. Is your program accredited? Provide summary report from last accreditation review.

   b. outside evaluation:

      Indicate any other foundations, professional associations or societies, or external peer reviews that are used to evaluate your
5. **Currency:**
Describe how your curriculum has responded to factors such as changing emphasis in the discipline, new technological development, changing character of society, current national curricular trends, demands by the profession and employers, etc.

6. **Professional support:**
What support (nonmonetary) is provided by your profession in contributing to the enhancement of your curriculum.

7. **Professional service:**
List the service or in-service activities sponsored by your program during the past five years and list the number of people accommodated in each activity. Were these activities offered for credit?

8. **Evidence of interdisciplinary activity:**
List any interdisciplinary/problem-based studies or activities emphasizing the unity of knowledge and the cooperative contributions of individual disciplines.

Briefly describe any courses developed by two or more departments for a major in your program or any cooperative arrangements that have been explored.

Briefly describe the interrelationship of your program with other programs.

9. **Evidence of use of senior project as a learning tool:**
Is senior project an essential component of your curriculum? What role does it play as a part of your major? How is senior project organized and managed in your department? How many students do not successfully complete senior project in your majors?

10. **Contribution to GE&B program at Cal Poly:**
If your program provides GE&B courses, please identify those courses.

11. **Student advising:**
Summarize the academic, professional, and career advising service that your program offers and its effectiveness.

Are advising responsibilities shared by all faculty? Briefly describe the department’s procedures to ensure that students receive accurate and timely academic advising.

---

**B. Faculty:**
Many of the faculty professional activities can be summarized in a table format. See Attachment E for example of a form to use.

1. **Demographics:**
   a. affirmative action target goals
   b. gender
   c. ethnic diversity

2. **Specific qualifications appropriate to discipline**
3. Diversity of faculty:
   a. professional background
   b. areas of expertise
   c. appropriate faculty expertise related to professional background

4. Professionalism and professional work experience

5. Evidence of teaching excellence for past five years

6. Evidence of mentoring and personal development of faculty for past five years

7. Service to the university, college, and community for past five years

8. Percent of tenure-track versus nontenure-track faculty

C. Students:

1. Student profile:
   *a. average SAT scores of enrolled FTE students
   *b. average GPA of new transfer students
   *c. gender and ethnicity
   d. honors, awards, scholarships:
      Are the trends of items a - d over the last five years of any significance to the program?
   e. number of students transferring into and out of major:
      What percent of your students leave your program as internal transfers per year? What percent of your students are internal transfers? Identify any major difficulties students transferring may have in completing the program.
   f. average quarterly class load enrolled in by major students:
      What percent of your students are primarily full-time students? Are significant numbers of students part-time because of program or institutional policy?
   g. Evidence of student involvement in program (i.e., clubs, extra projects, etc.)

2. Evidence of successful program completion:
   *a. student graduation rates:
      Do the trends over the last five years of the percentages of majors graduating indicate any significant changes in the program? Over the last five years, indicate the number of majors who have filed for graduation and the number who have completed their degree.
   *b. student persistence rates:
      How many students who enter eventually complete the program?
   *c. average length of time for students to graduate:
      Why are students not completing their degrees according to projected time frames?
   d. percent of graduate placement (over the last five years):
      (1) graduate programs at other universities:
         What percentage of your graduates attend graduate programs at other schools?
      (2) graduate programs at Cal Poly:
         What percentage of your graduates attend graduate programs at Cal Poly?
      (3) jobs requiring your or a similar college degree:
         What percent of your graduates are currently employed in
a field utilizing your or a similar college degree?

(4) **jobs requiring any other college degree:**
What percent of your graduates are currently employed in a field utilizing any other college degree?

(5) **unknown:**
Of your graduates, what percent is of unknown status?

e. **other evidence of success relevant to field:**
What are the pass rates for professional registration or certification, acceptance rates to graduates internships, etc.?

3. **Alumni evaluations (5-, 10-, 15-year post-graduation evaluations):**
a. **strengths of program:**
What input have you received from alumni regarding the strengths of your program?
b. **weaknesses of program:**
What input have you received from alumni regarding the weaknesses of your program?
c. **adequacy of knowledge acquired for entry level jobs:**
Do the students have an adequate level of knowledge acquired for entry-level jobs?
d. **adequacy of program to provide for the overall university experience:**
How does your program keep in contact with alumni? How do the responses from the different post-graduation ages differ?

D. **Academic Support Services**
1. **Adequacy of facilities/services:**
How adequate are your facilities such as classrooms, offices, laboratories, etc.?

2. **Adequacy of equipment inventories:**
How adequate is your equipment inventory including computers, lab equipment, and maintenance of this equipment?

3. **Adequacy of access to library resources:**
How adequate is your access to the resources available to the library:
   a. **quality and quantity of library collection:**
   Is the library’s collection sufficient in quality, depth, diversity, and currentness to meet the needs of the academic program?
   b. **Relationship to program:**
   Is the library’s collection structured in direct relationship to the nature and level of the academic program’s curricular offerings, including graduate courses?

III. **PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY**
   *A. Efficient use of state resources:*
   1. Faculty positions used and faculty positions generated by your program for each of the last five years.
   2. Staff positions used and staff positions generated by your program for each of the last five years.
   3. Administrative time used and administrative time generated by your program for each of the last five years.
   4. Average total cost (salary, O&E, equipment, travel, telephone, etc.) per annual SCU taught for your program for each of the last five years.
   5. Average total cost per FTE major student for your program for each of the last five years.
   6. Average annual WTU taught per FTEF for your program for each of the last five years (for each faculty member).
   7. Average quarterly faculty contact-hour load for your program (for each
B. Generation and use of non-state resources:
(If it should be acknowledged that there is not equal opportunity for all programs in this regard.)
1. Provide a list of all grants and contracts submitted and funded by your faculty for each of the last five years (give title and dollar amount).
2. For each of the last five years, list the amount of money generated via your programs fundraising efforts. Also indicate how this money was spent.
3. For each of the last five years, list the gifts of equipment, supplies, and services received by your program.
4. List all other non-state income generated for each of the last five years and indicate how that money was spent.

IV. PROGRAM NEED
A. Job market need:
Are graduates from the program in demand? If applicable, what is the ratio of requests for graduates at the Placement Center to actual graduates?

*B. Program uniqueness:
1. What is the need for the program at Cal Poly, in the State of California, nationwide? Compare enrollment to other programs in the state.
2. Are there courses offered in your department that are similar to courses offered in other departments? If so, what is the specific need for these courses within your department?

C. Integral component to state university education:
Is your program essential to CSU education?

*D. Student demand:
Provide data on the number of applicants to your program and the number of students accommodated. Include any other relevant information on these students if appropriate.

V. SELF-ASSESSMENT
Identify the strengths, weaknesses and any constraints existing for your program. Draw from the information compiled in the preceding sections of this document. Indicate strategies or plans designed to improve the areas of weakness and future areas of strengthening for your program.
Fifteen minutes will be set aside at the end of the meeting on Tuesday, May 3, to discuss the above resolutions and to express your feelings to our three statewide academic senators.

BACKGROUND ON DOMESTIC PARTNERS RESOLUTIONS

Under current law, public agencies which contract with PERS for employee health benefits may extend health coverage to "family members" of employees, including spouses and dependent children but not to domestic partners. The statewide Academic Senate has three resolutions before it concerning DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS which they have asked campus academic senates to respond to.

The FIRST resolution asks that the statewide Academic Senate support two bills before the legislature, SB 2061 and AB 2811, which will permit PERS to provide employee health benefits to domestic partners and their dependents.

The SECOND resolution urges campus senates to recognize domestic partnerships as legitimate family units and to support the extension of employee benefits to them as well as to their dependents.

The THIRD resolution supports the definition of domestic partners in AB 2810 and creates a statewide registry for domestic partners. This will also provide hospitalization rights, conservatorship rights, and the right to Will property to domestic partners.

A DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIP is defined in AB 2810 as follows:

A domestic partnership shall be established when all of the following requirements are met:

1. Both persons have a common residence; 2. Both persons agree to be jointly responsible for each other's basic living expenses during the domestic partnership; 3. Neither person is married or a member of another domestic partnership; 4. The two persons are not related by blood in a way which would prevent them from being married to each other in this state; 5. Both persons are at least 18 years of age; 6. Both file a Declaration of Domestic Partnership with the Secretary of State pursuant to this division.

A domestic partnership shall terminate when any one of the following occurs:

1. One partner gives or sends to the other partner a written notice that he or she has terminated the partnership; 2. One of the domestic partner dies; 3. One of the domestic partners marries; 4. The domestic partners no longer have a common residence.
Background Statement: Throughout the last several years, criticism has been received informally that the existing Faculty 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 made 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. The PPC approved (February 16, 1994) a resolution to adopt the revised Faculty Code of Ethics and include it in CAM.

After considering the American Association of University Professors' Statement of Ethics (revised, 1987), the PPC did not see any significant difference between its revision and the AAUP's revision. The PPC voted (April 20, 1994) to adopt the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics as the Faculty Code of Ethics for this campus.

The Personnel Policies Committee unanimously 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 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement of Professional Ethics (revised, 1987).
WHEREAS, The original Faculty Code of Ethics was based on the 1966 AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics; 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; and

WHEREAS, The AAUP has developed a national standard for professional ethics and responsibility which has been adopted by many institutions of higher education; and

WHEREAS, The AAUP has revised its Statement on Professional Ethics in 1987; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics (revised, 1987) be adopted as the Faculty Code of Ethics for this campus; and, be it further

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

Proposed by the Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
April 20, 1994
Vote: 5 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain
(2 absent)
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 the 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, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

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.
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.
Support for SB 2061 (Hart): Public Employees' Health Benefits: Domestic Partners

WHEREAS, The exclusion of domestic partners of the same or opposite sex and their dependents from employee benefits packages constitutes discrimination against employees solely on the basis of their nontraditional family status; and

WHEREAS, Senator Gary Hart (with principal co-author Assemblyman Richard Katz) has proposed enabling legislation [SB 2061 (Hart): Public Employees' Health Benefits: Domestic Partners] which would permit the Public Employment Retirement System to contract with agencies that provide health benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and

WHEREAS, A large and growing number of higher education institutions (e.g., Harvard, Columbia, Yale, MIT, Stanford, and the Universities of Chicago and Minnesota) have amended their employee benefits programs to provide employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and

WHEREAS, Over 136 major corporations in the United States (including AT&T, Apple, Microsoft, Bank of America, Levi Strauss, PG&E, MCA, HBO, Sprint, Time Magazine, Warner Brothers) provide employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and

WHEREAS, Cities such as San Francisco, Berkeley, and Seattle provide employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University support SB 2061 (Hart): Public Employees' Health Benefits: Domestic Partners which will permit the Public Employees Retirement System to contract with agencies that provide employee health benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and be it further

(over)
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates to support AB 2811 (Katz): Domestic Partners Health Care which would permit the Public Employees Retirement System to provide employee health benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to work with the California Faculty Association to support the enabling legislation. SB 2061 (Hart): Public Employees’ Health Benefits Domestic Partners, which would permit the Public Employees’ Retirement System to contract with agencies that provide employee health benefits to domestic partners and their dependents:

SECOND READING -- May 5-6, 1994
Extension of Employee Benefits in the California State University to Domestic Partners and their Dependents

WHEREAS, The current employment contract negotiated by the California Faculty Association (CFA) and the California State University (CSU) affords benefits only to blood-related families and those specific relationships traditionally recognized in civil courts; and

WHEREAS, The exclusion of domestic partners of the same or opposite sex and their dependents from employee benefits packages constitutes discrimination against employees solely on the basis of their nontraditional family status; and

WHEREAS, A large and growing number of higher education institutions (e.g., Harvard, Columbia, Yale, MIT, Stanford, and the Universities of Chicago and Minnesota) have amended their employee benefits programs to provide benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and

WHEREAS, Over 136 major corporations in the United States (including AT&T, Apple, Microsoft, Bank of America, Levi Strauss, PG&E, MCA, HBO, Sprint, Time Magazine, Warner Brothers) provide employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and

WHEREAS, Cities such as Seattle, San Francisco, and Berkeley provide employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University declare its recognition of the legitimacy of domestic partnerships and support the extension of employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and be it further

(over)
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates to declare the legitimacy of domestic partnerships and to support the extension of employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to work with the California Faculty Association to redress the fundamental unfairness of policies that exclude domestic partners and their dependents from employee benefits; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the California Faculty Association to bargain for agreements with the California State University that afford domestic partners and their dependents those employee benefits currently available only to blood-related families and those specific relationships traditionally recognized in civil court.

SECOND READING -- May 5-6, 1994
Support for AB 2810 (Katz): Domestic Partnership: Registration, Termination, and Rights Thereof

WHEREAS, The exclusion of domestic partners of the same or opposite sex and their dependents from employee benefits packages, hospital visitation rights, from conservatorship rights, and the right to Will property to one another constitutes discrimination against employees solely on the basis of their nontraditional family status; and

WHEREAS, Assemblyman Richard Katz has proposed legislation [AB 2810 (Katz): Domestic Partnership: Registration, Termination, and Rights Thereof] which would define domestic partners, including the qualifications for establishing and terminating partnerships, and create a statewide registry for domestic partners and would provide hospitalization rights, conservatorship rights, and the right to Will property to domestic partners; and

WHEREAS, The provisions AB 2810 (Katz) would benefit members of the CSU community who live in nontraditional families; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University support AB 2810 (Katz): Domestic Partnership: Registration, Termination, and Rights Thereof which defines domestic partners, including the qualifications for establishing and terminating partnerships, creates a statewide registry for domestic partners, and provides hospitalization rights, conservatorship rights, and the right to Will property to domestic partners; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates to support AB 2810 (Katz): Domestic Partnership: Registration, Termination, and Rights Thereof; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor, California State University Board of Trustees and the California Faculty Association to support AB 2810 (Katz): Domestic Partnership: Registration, Termination, and Rights Thereof.