CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California 93407 
ACADEMIC SENATE 

Academic Senate Agenda  
Tuesday, October 24, 1989  
UU 220 3:00-5:00 p.m.

I. Minutes: Approval of the October 3, 1989 Academic Senate minutes (pp. 2-5).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): 
A. Resolution(s) forwarded to President Baker: 
   AS-324-89/RC Resolution on State Faculty Support Grants- approved.
B. Academic Senate Reading List (p. 6).

III. Reports: 
A. President's Office 
B. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office 
C. Statewide Senators 
D. James Landreth - The role of Business Administration

IV. Consent Agenda: 
A. GE&B Proposal for AERO 210-Sandlin, Chair of the Aero Engineering Department (pp. 7-10). 
B. GE&B Committee recommendations on IT 401/301, HIST 319X, and HE 433- Hafemeister, Chair of the GE&B Committee (pp. 11-18).

V. Business Item(s): 
A. Resolution on Evaluation Procedures and Criteria-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, second reading (pp. 19-28). 
B. Resolution on Retention of Probationary Faculty-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, second reading (pp. 29-32). 
C. Resolution on CAM 543 Regarding Indirect Cost Sharing (ARDFA Facilities)-Moustafa, Chair of the Research Committee, second reading (pp. 33-39). 
D. Resolution on Department Name Changes-Executive Committee, first reading (p. 40).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 1989</td>
<td>Systemwide &amp; Statewide Assessment in California (Intersegmental Coordinating Council)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/89</td>
<td>Department of Public Safety Annual Report 1988-1989 (Cal Poly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **PROPOSER'S NAME**  
Russell M. Cummings

2. **PROPOSER'S DEPT.**  
Aero Engineering

3. **SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)**  
F.2

4. **COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)**  
AERO 210 History of Aviation, 3 units, 3 lectures.  
The history of the technological innovations which led to modern aviation. Examination of the people and circumstances that contributed to the major breakthroughs in aeronautics and astronautics. Discussion of current events in aviation.

5. **SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**  
Approved

6. **GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**  
Approved

7. **ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION**
Academic Senate

NEW COURSE PROPOSAL

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Department and School: AERO/SENG
Date: 2/10/87
Prepared by: Russell M. Cummings

1. PREFIX/NUMBER/TITLE
AERO 210 History of Aviation

5. COURSE DESCRIPTION (Follow catalog format; limit to 40 words)
The history of the technological innovations which led to modern aviation. Examination of the people and circumstances that contributed to the major breakthroughs in aeronautics and astronautics. Discussion of current events in aviation. 3 lectures.

8. QFS NUMBER(S)
C4

11. NUMBER OF SECTIONS ANTICIPATED

12. HOW FREQUENTLY COURSE WILL BE OFFERED

13. AVERAGE CLASS SIZE
20

14. ANNUAL W.T.
3.0

15. REQUIRED COURSE IN WHICH MAJOR/CONCENTRATION/MINOR

16. ELECTIVE COURSE IN WHICH MAJOR/CONCENTRATION/MINOR
Fulfills GE&B F.2 elective

19. JUSTIFICATION (Explain the need for this course)
This course would introduce students to the technological advances which have made aviation possible throughout history. They will gain a greater understanding for and appreciation of flight and space travel, especially as technology in this area has a greater impact on life.

20. FACILITIES, MATERIALS, AND EQUIPMENT NEEDED TO ACCOMMODATE COURSE
Standard lecture room.

*Courses proposed for inclusion in GE&B must be submitted to the GE&B Committee.
I. Catalog Description

AERO 210 History of Aviation (3)

The history of the technological innovations which led to modern aviation. Examination of the people and circumstances that contributed to the major breakthroughs in aeronautics and astronautics. Discussion of current events in aviation. 3 lectures.

II. Required Prerequisite Preparation

None.

III. Expected Outcome

This course will give the student the ability to appreciate the history and technological developments which have occurred in aeronautics and astronautics. Both the historical developments and their technological backgrounds will be learned. The student will understand the primary motivations for the major developments of aviation, and the form that the development took. Students will gain an understanding for the current advances taking place in aviation and how they affect society.

IV. Text and References


V. Minimum Student Materials Required

Textbook.

VI. Minimum Facilities Required

Chalkboard and Audiovisual Equipment.

VII. Expanded Description of Content

a. Historical survey of pre-1900 aviation
b. The developments in science and technology which made heavier-than-air flight possible.
c. The engineering and scientific techniques which the Wright Brothers used to develop the airplane.
d. The effects of world events on the advancement of aviation.
e. Personality sketches of the people who developed the science and technology of aeronautics and astronautics, and the effects of their contributions.
f. Basic physical concepts which make flight and space travel possible.
g. Current developments and future plans in aviation.
h. Relationship of people to aviation: effects of commercial aviation, military aviation, and space travel on our society.

VIII. Methods of Instruction and Evaluation

Lecture, films, occasional outside speakers, and possible field trips to sites which have played important roles in aviation history (Edwards or Vandenberg Air Force Bases).

Evaluation by examinations to be determined by instructor.

Midterm examination required.

Final examination required.
To: Jim Murphy, Chair of Academic Senate

From: Dave Hafemeister, Chair GE&B Academic Senate


The Committee on GE&B passed the following motions on October 6, 1989. These motions are now ready for consideration by the Academic Senate.

1. **IT 401/301. "Current Technological Issues"**. In order to conform to the numbering of other F.2 courses, such as Engineering 301, the Committee on GE&B voted unanimously to change the course numbering from IT 401 to IT 301. This will also make the course available to more students by lowering the prerequisites.

2. **History 319X. "Life, Culture, and Institutions:"**

   2.a. **Background**: The organizational flyer for the London program stated that HIST 319X was "pending for inclusion in GE&B Area D.4.b." Apparently this was never proposed or considered, and was, thus, misleading. A certain fraction of the 110 students from spring 1989 and summer 1989 thought that HIST 319X would count in D.4.b. An attached memo (10-5-89) from Harry Sharp, Interim Associate Dean of Liberal Arts, explains the situation.

   2.b. **Action**: It was unanimously agreed by the GE&B Committee that an exception would be made this time only to give GE&B Area D.4.b credit to those student who took HIST during the summer and spring 1989 London Study Program.

3. **HE 433. Historic Costume**: The attached materials for HE 433 were received by GE&B in May of 1989. In May 1989, Sub Committee D voted to reject HE 433 for inclusion in area D. The present GE&B Committee unanimously agrees with this decision.
Memorandum

To: Bill Rife, Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Programs

From: Harry Sharp, Interim Associate Dean
School of Liberal Arts

Subject: GE&B Credit for History X319, Spring 1989

The course in question was offered in London last spring. As indicated on the attached application form, students might have expected GEB credit in area D.4.b. It didn't happen, although I understand credit was authorized for area C.3 and the students were so informed after they were in London.

Apparently students who seek D.4.b. credit via petition have been turned down by department chairs in accordance with an understanding among departments that the History Department would not offer classes for D.4.b. inasmuch as they handle entirely History 315.

The problem is that at least some students went to London and signed up for History X319 in good faith anticipating D.4.b. credit (much to the embarrassment of the department).

At present it appears that some students may get D.4.b. credit via petition and others won't. That seems unfair. Consequently, I ask that the GE&B Committee give an advisory ruling on the possibility of a blanket substitution for Spring 1989 only allowing students who took the course to use it for either C.3. or D.4.b.

For 1990 the publicity on London does not show GEB credit for History X319.
Students must take a minimum of 12 units. HIST 319X, "London: Its Life, Culture, and Institutions" (3 units) is required. May be taken winter or spring. HUM 314X is optional, but provides credit for activities in which all students will be involved.

To assist in planning, please select courses (minimum 12 units) from those listed below. THEN select two MORE classes as alternative choices. Mark these alternative choices with an "A" following your checkmark. For HIST 319X, mark W or SP (winter or spring). NOTE: THIS IS AN INTEREST SURVEY ONLY!

ARCHITECTURE - Instructor: D. Swearingen
- ARCH 312 - Home & Comm Design (3) (F.2)
- ARCH 453 - Arch Design (5)

ART & DESIGN - Instructor: K. Dills
- ART 111 - Intro to Art (4 units) (C.2)
- ART 112 - Survey of West Art (3) (C.2)

ECONOMICS - Instructor: W. Rice
- ECON 304 - Comp Econ Systems (3) (D.4.b)
- ECON 337 - Money, Bank & Credit (4)

ENGLISH - Instructors: K. Gittes, J. Simmons, R. Waldron
- ENGL 230 - Brit Lit thru 18th Cent (4) (C.1)
- ENGL 231 - Brit Lit: Romantic to Pres (4) (C.1)
- ENGL 302 - Adv Comp (4)
- ENGL 330 - Brit Lit: Medieval (4)
- ENGL 338X - Intro to Shakes (4) (C.3)
- ENGL 380 - Contemp Lit Ideas (3-4) (C.3)

FD SCI & NUTRITION - Instructor: S. Burroughs
- FSN 210 - Nutrition (3) (E.2)

HUMANITIES - Instructor: Staff
- HUM 314X - London: Life, Cult, & Inst (2-activity)

HISTORY - Instructor: D. Krieger, E. Mayo
- HIST 204 - Hist of Amer Ideals & Inst (3)
- HIST 402 - American Rev (3)
- HIST 315 - Mod World Hist (3) (D.2)
- HIST 319X - London: Its Life, Cult & Inst (3)

MUSIC - Instructor: R. Ratcliffe
- MUS 204 - Apprec of Music in London (4) (C.2)

ORNA HORTICULTURE - Instructor: R. Gordon
- OH 330 - Flower Arrange (non-majors) (4)
- OH 401 - Field Studies in OH (1)
- OH 470 - Select Adv Lab (4-6)

PHILOSOPHY - Instructor: T. Scriven
- PHIL 231 - Philos Classics (3) (C.1)
- PHIL 335 - Soc Ethics (3) (C.3)

POLITICAL SCIENCE - Professor: R. Kranzdorf
- POLS 105 - Intro to Inter Rel (3)
- POLS 370 - Contemp Global Issues (3) (D.4.b)
- POLS 415 - Politics In Britain (4)

SOCIIOLOGY - Instructor: B. Mori
- SOC 105 - Intro to Soc (3) (D.4.a)
- SOC 311 - Soc of Sex Roles (3)
- SOC 315 - Race Relations (3) (D.4.b)
Subject: HE 433 for Area D

The Home Economics Department's new curriculum coordinator neglected to submit their proposal for HE 433 (Historic Costume) to your subcommittee although it went forward to the Senate Curriculum Committee with their other proposals. I have attached copies of the HE 433 proposal.

I do not know if you need to convene a meeting to evaluate this proposal or if discussion can take place on the phone. I have asked Pat McKim to poll each of you on this. I would appreciate your reading the attached right away as the GE&B Committee needs your recommendation by next Tuesday.
1. PROPOSER'S NAME
   Weber, Barbara

2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.
   Home Economics

3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (Include section, and subsection if applicable)
   D (assumption is D.4.b)

4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)
   HE 433 HISTORIC COSTUME (3): Chronological study of costume designs as related to cultural influences. 3 lectures.

5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS
   The Subcommittee only recently received information on this course (5/89); we recommend against inclusion in D on the grounds that this course is too major specific for GE&B; the nonwestern aspects of this course are in doubt.

6. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS
   Decision deferred until Fall, 1989.

7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION
   /
V. Add a course to those approved for GE&B

TO: GE&B Committee

FROM: Barbara Weber, Department Head, Home Economics
       Nancy Morris, Assistant Professor, Home Economics

Please consider HE 433, Historic Costume (3 units) for inclusion in GE&B category D which deals with human social, political, and economic institutions and behavior and their historical background. The Historic Costume course is a survey of fashion in the western world from antiquity to present day.

It provides the student with information about the cultural values, artistic ideals, and political and social events of periods that affected directly or indirectly the nature of the fashions of the time.

An important point to mention here is the way in which clothing is used by man. It works on two levels; on one level it provides warmth and protection, on the other it is a form of expression and communication. In the area of communication clothing acts as a means of identification, often giving information such as position in society, feelings about conforming to social norms, values, attitudes, and occupation. Fashion serves the social system by acting as an agent and as a symbol of changing social attitudes.

For centuries of recorded history, styles of dress have evolved in a progression of innovations and changes. Historians and social analysts have reported that many of these changes have been influenced by shifts in the social environment and lifestyles of societies.¹

To understand the evolution of fashions, one needs to examine underlying forces which stimulate fashion change such as historical events. Changing sex roles, new values, new social opportunities, and dominant groups of people. Through studying the history of costume the student becomes aware that fashions through history have reflected the "zeitgeist" or spirit of the times in which they were created.

1. Catalog Description

HE 433 Historic Costume (3)

Chronological study of garment designs as related to dominant cultural influences. 3 lectures.

2. Required Background of Experience

None.

3. Expected Outcomes

The student will be able to:

a. Understand the influence of social, religious and political conditions upon costume and the fashion cycle.
b. Develop an appreciation of the costumes of past ages.
c. Realize the close relationship between costume and the art and literature of any given period of history.
d. Recognize the influence of historic costume upon contemporary fashion.
e. Develop a perspective on the forms and functions of dress within a culture and among cultures, during the same or different periods of history.
f. Value the surviving fragments of clothing as tangible resources for the study of cultures of the past.

4. Text and References


References:

Boucher, F. 20,000 years of fashion: the history of costume and personal adornment.


5. Minimum Student Materials

Textbook, notebook and library references.

6. Minimum College Facilities

Audiovisual equipment, adequate library holdings, chalkboard, storage facilities for reproductions and actual historic costumes.

7. Expanded Description of the Course

a. Costume reflects the social, political, and economic changes throughout history.
b. Advancements in art and science directly influence costume.
c. Historic art and literature are tools which may be used to supplement knowledge of historic costume.
d. Historic costumes differ not only in various cultures but also within cultures such as clothing of the male and female.
e. Contemporary costumes are influenced by historic costume designs.

8. Methods of Instruction and Evaluation

Lecture on pertinent historical background with emphasis upon costumes of the past; illustrations of historic costume by use of audiovisual equipment and collections, field trips.

Student research project, midterm examinations, and final examination.
WHEREAS, Campus Administrative Manual (CAM), section 341, is currently out-of-date; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the current CAM 341 be deleted; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the following CAM 341 be added:

CAM 341 EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA

A. Procedures

1. Evaluations shall be conducted in accordance with Article 15 of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the California State University (CSU) and Unit 3 Faculty.

2. Each school or other organizational unit (e.g., library) shall develop its own written statement of procedures and criteria for each type of personnel action. (In this section, the use of the word school includes the library and other organizational units covered under the Unit 3 contract.) Departments desiring to develop statements to serve as addenda to the school-wide statement may do so. Full-time probationary and full-time tenured faculty may participate in the development and/or subsequent amendment of these procedures and criteria. School and department statements are subject to review and approval by the school dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and shall be in accordance with the MOU and university policies.

3. Timetables for evaluations shall be published annually and shall be developed in consultation with the Academic Senate.

4. The terms Personnel Action File and Working Personnel Action File are defined in Article 2.17 of the MOU and will hereafter be
Resolution on Evaluation
Procedures and Criteria
AS- -89/

referred to as the Files. All evaluators must sign the logs in the Files before they make their recommendations. It is the professional obligation of all evaluators to review the information in the Files before they vote or provide a written recommendation.

5. At the department level, the department head/chair is the custodian of the Working Personnel Action File and, if appropriate, the Personnel Action File; at the school level, the custodian of the Files is the dean; at the university level, the custodian is the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Custodians of the Files and Peer Review Committee (PRC) chairs shall ensure the confidentiality of the Files. Normally, there shall be no duplication of file materials except for copies made for the candidate or appropriate administrator, or for distribution at PRC meetings. At the conclusion of each PRC meeting, the PRC chair is responsible for the collection of all duplicated materials. The only exception to this policy is that copies of the candidate's resume may be distributed to PRC members for use at times other than PRC meetings. After the PRC has made its recommendation, the copies of the resume shall be collected by the chair.

6. Each PRC evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of that committee. There are occasions when a member of a PRC may feel that s/he cannot evaluate a candidate for some reason; e.g., conflict of interest, prejudice, or bias, etc. In such a case, that committee member will not participate or vote in the evaluation of that candidate. For purposes of determining a simple majority vote of the PRC, the membership of the committee shall be defined as those faculty casting yes or no votes.

7. Evaluative statements shall be based on the Files and should be validated with evidence such as class visitation, measurement of student achievement, course outlines and tests, significant curricular, scholarly, and
committee contributions, publications, and opinions of peers and students. If, at any level, the evidence is judged unsatisfactory, or if it does not appear to support the recommendations made, the Working Personnel File shall be returned to the appropriate level for clarification.

When recommendations of the department head/chair and/or school PRC and/or dean are not in conformity with the recommendations of the department PRC, a full explanation of the reasons for the contrary recommendation shall be conveyed, in writing, to the department PRC by the first level of review at which the contrary recommendation is made.

8. Recommendations of PRC's at each level (department or school) must be accompanied by one of the following:
   a. A majority report and a minority report (if applicable). Both reports must include substantiating reasons and each report must be signed by those PRC members who support the report and the substantiating reasons.
   b. Individual recommendations from each PRC member (who participated in the evaluation). These recommendations must include substantiating reasons and must be signed.
   c. A combination of "a" and "b" above: a majority report, a minority report (if applicable), and individual recommendations from those members of the Peer Review Committee who support neither the majority nor the minority report. In any event, each report or recommendation must include substantiating reasons and must be signed by those who support it.

9. Department heads/chairs and deans shall use the Faculty Evaluation Form (Form 109) to evaluate faculty for retention, tenure, and promotion. Comments regarding student evaluations must be included in Section 1 of Form 109.

10. Guidelines for student evaluations are found in Administration Bulletin 74-1. School and
Resolution on Evaluation
Procedures and Criteria
AS- -89/

department procedures for student evaluations shall be in accordance with this administrative bulletin and the MOU.

B. Criteria

1. Evaluative criteria shall emphasize teaching performance, but also should include professional growth and achievement, service to the university and community and possession of appropriate academic preparation. Although teaching effectiveness is the primary and essential criterion, it alone is not sufficient for retention, tenure, and promotion.

2. The intensity of the evaluation process will vary in accordance with the academic position of the candidate. For example, the granting of tenure requires stronger evidence of worthiness than retention, and promotion to Professor requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Professor.

3. Evaluation of faculty involves a "comprehensive assessment" with appointment and retention seen as leading to tenure. It should be understood that if a faculty member does not have the potential to achieve tenure, then that individual should not be reappointed. Similarly, a candidate who does not have the potential for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor should not be granted tenure. This does not mean that retention is a guarantee of tenure nor is tenure a guarantee of promotion.

Proposed By:
Personnel Policies Committee
Date: September 19, 1989
PROMOTIONS, REAPPOINTMENTS, TENURE, AND TERMINATIONS

Evaluation Procedures and Criteria

Academic Employees

A. Consultative Procedures

Only tenured faculty, department heads, and other academic administrators may participate in deliberations, voting, and formal recommendations at all levels of review on appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and termination of faculty. Such recommendations must originate at the department or, where applicable, school or division level, and pass through appropriate levels to the University President or a designee.

Information from other faculty members, students, and any other sources is to be considered by those who originate the first-level recommendations and by those who review those recommendations.

The Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate shall serve as a university-wide level of review of faculty personnel actions relating to retention, tenure, promotions, termination, and leaves with pay. Although this committee does not function as a grievance body, it may review and make recommendations within the guidelines outlined below in those cases where there is disagreement among the recommendations made by the department committees, department heads, and school deans; or in other cases when a faculty member believes that unusual circumstances have resulted in an unjust decision. However, the committee shall not review a case unless the faculty member has requested such review in writing. The findings and recommendations of the Personnel Review Committee shall be submitted to the President via the Vice President for Academic Affairs with a copy to the school dean in accordance with dates specified in subsequent sections. (See Appendix V.)

To insure consistency in the application of criteria by individual departments, divisions or schools, the Personnel Review Committee shall have access to a sampling of positive recommendations for comparison purposes.

Professional judgments are not subject to review by the Personnel Review Committee except in cases when there is an indication that prejudice, capriciousness, discrimination, or other improper conditions were involved. Where no improper circumstances are found to exist, the resources of the Personnel Review Committee should not be used to question the professional judgments of those fixed with a more immediate responsibility for faculty performance. Therefore, in reviewing cases the Personnel Review Committee should be concerned only with whether:

1. Established procedures were followed;
2. The recommended action was based on discrimination or prejudice;
3. Sufficient information was considered in the procedures to warrant the recommendation;
4. All relevant information was considered; and
5. Departments, divisions or schools were consistent in the application of stated or established criteria.

Upon receipt from the Vice President for Academic Affairs of the names of individuals whose cases represent disagreement among recommendations cited above or whose recommendations were all negative, the Chairperson of the Personnel Review Committee shall inform these individuals that they may request a review by the committee. In such invitation the Chairperson shall make it clear that the Personnel Review Committee will be concerned with any or all of the five items enumerated above.

Added March, 1978
Further, the Chairperson shall direct those persons requesting review to restrict any comments and supporting data to the five items enumerated above. Those requesting review shall also send copies of their request, comments, and supporting data to their department head and to their dean or division head.

Upon receipt of such a request the committee Chairperson shall notify the dean and department head concerned. The dean and department head shall send copies of their comments, if any, to the PRC and to the faculty member requesting review. The Personnel Review Committee shall review the case and make a report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

B. Performance Evaluations for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Performance evaluations of all academic employees are made annually for promotions, for tenure, for reappointments, and for any other recommended personnel action. Performance evaluations for full- and part-time lecturers are made annually by June 1. (See Faculty Evaluation Form, Appendix I.)

It is the responsibility of the department head to render all possible advice and assistance to members of the department in carrying out their teaching assignments, and particularly to new members of the department. This would include personal observation of the classes assigned new faculty members. The purpose of such observation is to assist the teacher through constructive criticism, to provide a more systematic basis for the evaluation process, and to assure that the fundamental objective of quality instructional programs is being met. Regular periodic conferences should be held at least once during the reappointment cycle and at other times as deemed necessary by the tenured reviewing faculty and academic administrators with each probationary faculty member to provide the latter with full perspective concerning strengths and weaknesses, possible means of improvement, and the current prospect for reappointment or tenure.

C. Post Tenure Peer Review

Schools and departments, with student participation, should develop procedures for peer evaluation of tenured faculty instructional performance including currency in the field, appropriate to university education. The procedures shall be compatible with the following University guidelines:

1. Annually, department heads and deans will be required to evaluate tenured Assistant Professors, steps 1 - 4; tenured Associate Professors, steps 1 - 9; and tenured Professors, steps 1 - 3, for merit salary adjustment purposes only. This will be accomplished by using pages 4 and 5, Form 109 (Faculty Evaluation Form).

Assistant Professors, step 5; Associate Professors, step 5; and Professors, steps 4 and 5, shall undergo post-tenure peer review at least once every five years. In addition, if a department head or dean has reason to believe that a faculty member is performing unsatisfactorily, a post-tenure peer review by the departmental full Professors shall be conducted as soon as possible.

2. Post-Tenure review of Professors

a. All Professors at Step 4 shall undergo a post-tenure peer review by the departmental tenured full Professors prior to June 1 of the academic year they reach that rank/step.

b. Peer review of tenured Professors, Step 5, shall occur at least once every five years after initial evaluation.

(1) Only departmental tenured full Professors are eligible to participate at the first level of peer review.

Revised November, 1980
Added November, 1980
(2) If the department has no tenured Professors, the evaluation shall be conducted only by the department head and dean. Consideration shall be given to student evaluations.

(3) The criteria for post-tenure review of full Professors will be the same as for promotion to the Professor level, unless supplemental department or school criteria are approved.

3. Post-tenure peer review of Associate Professors

a. During the academic year that a tenured Associate Professor reaches Step 5, one of the following two courses of action shall be taken:

   (1) If the professor requests promotion consideration, the evaluation shall be conducted under established promotion procedures and criteria. Such evaluation will be considered as satisfying the requirements for post-tenure peer review.

   (2) If promotion consideration is not requested, a peer review by the departmental Professors shall be made in accordance with Board of Trustee policy.

      (a) The criteria for post-tenure review shall be the same as for promotion to Associate Professor, unless supplemental department or school criteria are approved.

      (b) If the department has no tenured Professors, the evaluation shall be conducted by the department head and dean. Consideration shall be given to student evaluations.

      (c) Peer review of tenured Associate Professors, Step 5, shall occur at least once every five years.

b. Although post-tenure peer review of Associate Professors below Step 5 is not required, such faculty shall arrange for periodic conferences with the department head and senior faculty for advice and assistance regarding progress toward promotion during the year they are at Step 3.

4. Post-tenure Review Assistant Professors

a. During the academic year that a tenured Assistant Professor reaches Step 5, one of the following two courses of action shall be taken:

   (1) If the professor requests promotion consideration, evaluation shall be under established promotion procedures and criteria. Such evaluation will be considered as satisfying the requirements for post-tenure review.

   (2) If promotion consideration is not requested, peer review by the department Professors shall be made in accordance with Board of Trustee policy.

      (a) The criteria for evaluation shall be the same as for the award of tenure, unless supplemental department or school criteria are approved.

      (b) If the department has no tenured Professors, the evaluation shall be conducted by the department head and dean. Consideration shall be given to student evaluations.

b. Post-tenure review of tenured Assistant Professors, Step 5, shall occur at least once every five years.

Added November, 1980
5. The Faculty Evaluation Form 109 can be used in its present form or modified as appropriate to meet specific departmental or school needs. The peer evaluation may be in a written narrative form signed by the committee chairman or by individuals who reviewed the professor. The evaluation shall include the process used, the reasons for recommendations, and evidence in sufficient detail to validate the findings. In those instances where the consultative evaluations represent a consensus opinion signed by the committee chairperson, the filing of a minority report by committee member(s) whose opinions differ from the views expressed in the majority report should accompany the majority report at the time it is forwarded to the department head.

6. Post-tenure peer evaluations shall be forwarded to the department head no later than May 1. Department heads' and deans' evaluations should be completed prior to June 1, using Faculty Evaluation Form 109. The department head shall meet with each faculty member evaluated to discuss the results of the evaluations. If areas for improvement are identified, the department head shall advise the faculty member of avenues for assistance available within the department or university. The written evaluations shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel file which is maintained in the school dean's office.

D. Evaluation Criteria

Each school or other organizational unit shall develop, consistent with general university policy, its own written statement of procedures and criteria for each type of personnel action. Departments desiring to develop statements to serve as addenda to the schoolwide statement may do so. Members of the school and/or department, whether tenured or not, shall equally participate in the development and/or subsequent amendment of these procedures and criteria. School and departmental statements are subject to review and approval by the school dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The President will approve criteria for personnel actions for the Division of Student Affairs.

Evaluative criteria shall emphasize teaching performance, but also should include scholarly and creative achievements, contributions to the community, contributions to the institution, and possession of appropriate academic preparation. Although teaching effectiveness is the primary and essential criterion, it alone is not sufficient for appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion. The intensity of the evaluation process will vary in accordance with the academic position of the faculty member. Thus, granting of tenure requires stronger evidence of worthiness than reappointment; promotion to Professor requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Professor, etc.

However, evaluation of faculty involves a "comprehensive assessment" with appointment and retention seen as leading to tenure. It should be understood that if a faculty member is not likely to pass the test for obtaining tenure, then the individual should not be reappointed; if the faculty member does not have the potential for promotion to Associate Professor or beyond, tenure should not be accorded.

Each faculty member subject to evaluation shall update his/her personnel file, using the Faculty Resume Worksheet appearing in CAM Appendix XII as a guide. The basic evaluation of a faculty member's teaching ability and professional competence will be made by colleagues in that field and the department head. The faculty member will be evaluated in accordance with the established criteria for professional performance and comparatively against the performance of colleagues.

In those schools and/or departments where the evaluation procedure calls for a vote by faculty members conducting the evaluation and making a recommendation, the statement of procedures and criteria shall identify how abstention votes are to be treated.

Added November, 1980
Revised August, 1982
Faculty members should be advised prior to initial appointment about the importance of teaching effectiveness and the emphasis on particular criteria which will prevail in later decisions on reappointment, tenure, and promotion. For example, if the doctorate is required for tenure, the faculty member should be so advised.

E. Justification for Recommendations

Evaluative statements should be validated with reliable evidence such as class visitation, measurement of student achievement, course outlines and tests, committee work, publications, opinion of peers and students, and statement of the faculty member being evaluated. If, at the level of the department head or dean, the evidence is judged to be unsatisfactory, or if it does not appear to support the recommendations made, the file will be returned to the previous level for amplification.

When recommendations of the department head and/or the dean are not in conformity with, or are subsequently changed so they are not in conformity with, the recommendations of the faculty unit or committee consulted, full explanation of the reasons for a contrary recommendation should be conveyed to the faculty unit or committee consulted and to the individual involved by the first level reviewer expressing a contrary recommendation.

F. Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty

See Administrative Bulletin 74-1 in the Appendix.

341.2 Support Staff Employees

Performance evaluations of support staff employees will be made after 3, 6, and 9 months of employment during the probationary period; and for permanent employees, annually. Permanent status is established after 12 months of approved full-time service. (See Support Staff Employee Performance Evaluation Form, Appendix II)

The supervisor will use the Support Staff Employee Performance Evaluation Form to evaluate staff employees during their first year of probation and annually thereafter.

The Staff Personnel Officer will act as the reviewing officer for the purpose of verifying completion of all evaluations and noting any problems that appear to require further action.

341.3 Administrative Employees

Performance evaluations for administrative employees will be made at the end of the 6, 12, and 18 months of employment during the probationary period; and for permanent employees, annually. Permanent status is established after two years of approved full-time service. The supervisor will use the Administrative Employee Evaluation Form in Appendix III to evaluate administrative employees.

341.4 Instructional Department Heads and Academic Deans

See Administrative Bulletins 77-2 and 74-2 in the Appendix.

341.5 Evaluation of Academic Administrators

The following resolution was adopted by the Board of Trustees regarding the evaluation of academic administrators:

"Academic administrators serve at the pleasure of the President. It is the policy of the CSUC that all academic administrators be evaluated at regular intervals. It is necessary that the evaluator be aware of the perception of those who work with the administrator. The President shall develop procedures for the systematic acquisition of information and comments, and from

Added March, 1981
appropriate administrators, faculty, staff and students in the work of the
administrator to be evaluated."

Campus policy implementing the resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees is
described in this section.

Tenure does not apply to academic administrative assignments. Persons serving in
academic administrative assignments shall retain any tenure rights already earned
either as an academic or administrative employee. Persons initially employed in
academic administrative assignments at the campus shall, while serving in such
assignments, serve a probationary period toward and may acquire academic or adminis­
trative tenure according to the relevance of their assignment and qualifications for
either an academic or administrative position. While on probationary status, such
employees will be subject to annual performance evaluations in accordance with
applicable procedures and criteria for their respective division (Academic Affairs,
Administrative Affairs, or Student Affairs). Those employees who are tenured and
serving in academic administrative assignments will be evaluated at least once every
three years. The evaluator will use Administrative Evaluation Form (Personnel Form
139) to conduct performance reviews.

Prior to October 1 of each year, the Director of Personnel Relations will prepare a
list of academic administrators who are subject to evaluation that year. Upon receipt
of this list, the evaluator should request input, as appropriate, from administrators,
faculty, staff and students. Evaluations should be completed and discussed with the
person rated prior to June 1 of the same academic year.

The Executive Vice President, Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Dean of
Students will be either the rating or the reviewing officer for their respective
divisions and will be responsible for monitoring and verifying the completion of all
evaluations pursuant to this policy.

342 Promotions

342.1 Criteria for Support Staff and Administrative Promotions

Whenever possible, promotions will be made from within the staff based upon the
following factors of evaluation as listed in order of importance:

A. Demonstrated ability in terms of the job to be done
B. Reliability
C. Willingness to work with and cooperative attitude toward fellow workers
D. Loyalty
E. Length of service

342.2 Academic Promotions

A. Eligibility

1. Persons occupying academic rank positions but assigned full time to nonin­
structional duties will be considered for promotion by the administration;
persons assigned to both teaching and instructional-administrative duties will
be considered for promotion in both areas.

2. Normally promotions of academic employees may be made only after the
completion of at least one full academic year of service in the fifth salary
step of the rank. In case of overlapping steps in salary ranges between
academic ranks, an individual will receive at the time of promotion a one-step
increase in salary. Individuals are not eligible for promotion in academic

Added March, 1981

Revised April, 1983
WHEREAS, Campus Administrative Manual (CAM), section 343.1, is currently out-of-date; therefore, be it
RESOLVED: That the current CAM 343.1 be deleted; and, be it
further
RESOLVED: That the following CAM 343.1 be added:

CAM 343

343.1 RETENTION OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY UNIT MEMBERS

A. Procedures

1. Performance reviews for the purpose of retention shall be in accordance with CAM 341 and Articles 13 and 15 of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the California State University (CSU) and Unit 3 Faculty.

2. Applicants for retention shall submit a resume which indicates evidence supporting retention. This resume shall include all categories pertinent to retention consideration: teaching activities and performance, or librarian effectiveness and performance; professional growth and achievement; service to the university and community; and any other activities which indicate professional commitment, service or contribution to the discipline, department, school or library (in the case of librarians), university, or community.

3. Recommendations for retention are based on the same factors as for promotions (see CAM 342.2.B.4).

Proposed By:
Personnel Policies Committee
Date: September 19, 1989
Revised: October 3, 1989
Reappointment Procedure During Probationary Period (See CAM 344 for tenure appointments.)

Procedure for Probationary Academic Employees (See Appendix V for Schedule of Deadlines.)

A. Each year by October 1, the Director of Personnel Relations will send to directors, department heads, division heads, school deans, and vice presidents a list of academic personnel in their respective areas of responsibility who will have completed at the close of the current college year one or more probationary years of service. The processing of evaluations and recommendations for academic personnel (Counselors, Student Affairs Officers, Librarians, and Academic Administrators) under the Dean of Students, the Executive Vice President, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs is subject to the same procedures and deadlines as outlined in this section. The only exception is that these recommendations of reappointment or nonreappointment (for tenure or nontenure see CAM 344.2.A.) are sent for appropriate action to the President by the Dean of Students and the vice presidents. For academic employees serving in academic-administrative assignments, the Administrative Employee Evaluation Form (Appendix III) is used.

B. Each faculty member subject to evaluation shall update his/her personnel file, using the Faculty Resume Worksheet appearing in CAM Appendix XII as a guide. Department heads will evaluate personnel on their respective lists in accordance with CAM 341. They will submit to their respective school deans the names of probationary personnel recommended and not recommended for appointment for the subsequent academic year. Submission dates are November 1 in the case of employees with two or more years of probationary service, and January 17 in the case of employees with one year of probationary service. In addition, each first year probationary faculty member whose academic rank appointment followed employment as a full-time lecturer in the spring, spring and winter, or spring, winter and fall quarters of the previous college year should be evaluated by November 1. In arriving at the recommendations, the department head will consult tenured members of the department staff, and the results of such consultation must be presented in writing to accompany the recommendations. The consultative evaluation signed by the committee chairperson or the committee members, or individually signed statements, shall include reasons in sufficient detail to validate the recommendations of the consulted group. In those instances where the consultative evaluation represents a consensus opinion and is signed by the committee chairperson, the filing of a minority report by committee members whose opinions differ from the views expressed in the majority report is permitted and encouraged. To insure consideration, such a minority report should accompany the majority report at the time it is forwarded to the department head.

C. School deans will submit their respective lists with their own recommendations including those for department heads to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by November 15 in the case of employees with two years of service, and first year faculty with prior full-time lecturership employment as defined in "H" above; by December 5 in the case of employees with three or more years of service; and by January 31 in the case of employees with one year of service.

D. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will submit by November 19, December 10, and February 9, respectively, a listing of the names of personnel not recommended for reappointment to the chairperson of the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate for review by the Committee. At the request of the Chairperson of the Personnel Review Committee, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall provide a sampling of positive recommendations for comparison purpose.

E. The Chairperson of the Personnel Review Committee will forward to the appropriate Vice President or Dean of Students by December 1, January 15, and February 15, respectively, the results of its review of the recommendations, together with its own recommendations.

Revised August, 1982 | Revised December, 1982
F. Acting for the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will notify all second year academic employees not being considered for tenure by December 15 of either (1) reappointment to a third probationary year; or (2) that notification will be given no later than June 1 regarding the third probationary year. Academic employees with three or more years of probationary service who are not being considered for tenure will be notified by the Vice President for Academic Affairs by December 15 concerning reappointment. Academic employees being considered for tenure will be notified on the same terms as above by the President of according or nonaccording of tenure. (See CAM 344.2.)

G. The same review process as outlined above will be used for those academic personnel who were advised that they would receive notice by June 1 concerning their status for the next academic year. For such academic personnel, the deadline schedule listed below will be followed in processing recommendations:

- April 15: From Department to Deans, Division Heads or Directors
- April 28: From Dean to Appropriate Vice President or Dean of Students
- May 5: From Vice President for Academic Affairs to Personnel Review Committee, Academic Senate
- May 18: From Personnel Review Committee to Appropriate Vice President or Dean of Students (with copy to school dean)
- June 1: Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies the individual concerning reappointment and the President notifies the individual concerning tenure

H. Recommendations will be based on teaching performance and/or other professional performance, professional growth and achievement, service to university and community, and such other factors as ability to relate with colleagues, initiative, cooperativeness, dependability, and health. (See Faculty Evaluation Form, Appendix I.)

I. Terminal Notice Year

Under provisions of 5 Cal. Adm. Code 43561, a faculty member serving a third, fourth, fifth, or sixth year of probationary service is entitled to an additional academic year of employment (identified in Title 5 as a "terminal 'notice' year," or "terminal year") if the decision to terminate employment is communicated to the faculty member during any one of those probationary years.

J. If the department head recommends nonreappointment, a written invitation shall be forwarded by the department head to the individual to discuss the decision; if an initial recommendation of nonreappointment is made by the school dean, the dean shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision in the presence of the department head.

K. Notifications of reappointment and nonreappointment are made in accordance with 5 Cal. Adm. Code 43566 as follows:

1. Notification of all decisions regarding reappointment and nonreappointment shall be in writing and signed by the University President or a designee.
2. The notice of intention not to reappoint a probationary academic employee shall be mailed by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the academic employee's last known address, or the notice may be delivered to the academic employee in person who shall acknowledge receipt of the notice in writing. If
such notice is delivered to the academic employee and the employee refuses to acknowledge receipt thereof, the person delivering the notice shall make and file with the University President an affidavit of service thereof, which affidavit shall be regarded as equivalent to acknowledgment of receipt of notice.

3. Reappointment to a succeeding academic year may be accomplished only by notice by the President or a designee. Notwithstanding any provision of the Campus Administrative Manual to the contrary, no person shall be deemed to have been reappointed because notice is not given or received by the time or in the manner prescribed in the Campus Administrative Manual. Should it occur that no notice is received by the times prescribed in the Campus Administrative Manual, it is the duty of the academic employee concerned to make inquiry to determine the decision of the President, who shall without delay give notice in accordance with this section.

343.2 Procedure for Administrative Employees

A. Administrative employees serve a two-year probationary period and are evaluated in six-month cycles. At the time of evaluation, the supervisor will forward the evaluation form together with a recommendation for or against continuance of employment through appropriate channels to the dean, division head, or vice presidents. (See CAM 344.3.)

B. In the case of a recommendation against continuance of employment, the dean, division head, or vice president will forward the evaluation form and a copy of the recommendation to the Executive Vice President.

C. The Executive Vice President will notify the employee of the decision not to continue employment as follows:

1. Follow completion of six months or more of continuous service, notice shall be given not less than 15 days prior to the assigned date of separation; or

2. Following completion of 12 months or more of continuous service, notice shall be given not less than 30 days prior to the assigned date of separation; or

3. Following completion of 18 months or more of continuous service, notice shall be given no later than the last day of the probationary period and not less than 45 days prior to the assigned date of separation.

4. An administrative employee shall not become a permanent employee on beginning the third year of service if notice of rejection pursuant to this section has been given at any time during the probationary period.

D. Recommendations will be based on job performance, personal relationships, professional ethics, and acceptance and implementation of department, school, and campuswide objectives. (See Administrative Employee Evaluation Form, Appendix III.)

343.3 Procedure for Support Staff Employees

A. At the time of the employee's first and second performance evaluations (end of third and sixth months of employment), the supervisor will forward the evaluation form together with a recommendation for or against continuance of employment through appropriate channels to the dean, division head, or vice presidents. (See CAM 341.)

B. In the case of a recommendation against continuance of employment, the school dean or division head, not later than one month and one week prior to the proposed effective date, will forward a decision to the Personnel Office.

C. The Personnel Office will notify the employee in case of a decision not to continue employment. Every effort will be made to make this notification one month prior to the effective date.
Background statement:

Sponsored project direct costs are usually identified as those costs directly related to the project itself. Other costs are incurred which are called indirect costs or overhead and include the purchase of desks, tables, and equipment, which are one time purchases, as well as such items as telephone use, heating, fiscal and programmatic administration, development costs, and custodial services. Start up costs are a special case of the normal overhead. This resolution addresses the normal overhead and the special start up costs associated with the initiation and operation of Building 04, ARDFA.

Indirect costs have been traditionally used at Cal Poly to cover administrative costs of sponsored programs in the Foundation and university Business Office and sponsored programs development in the Grants Development Office. Indirect costs remaining after these costs have been met have been distributed according to a formula that sends 50 percent to the Academic Research Committee for CARE grants, 40 percent to the department responsible for the award to assist in the continued development of that grant and similar ones, and 10 percent to the principal investigator for her/his professional development. This formula was most recently reviewed by the Academic Senate and revised in 1987.

Grants are normally conducted in campus facilities supported by the instructional program. A faculty member may use her/his own office, or a portion of a laboratory when it is not used for a classroom activity. As such, a research activity may encounter only minimal problems in getting set up.

When the School of Engineering vacated Building 04, the building was reassigned for Applied Research and Development Facility and Activities (ARDFA). When the Engineering departments relocated to Building 13, they removed from Building 04 many useful appurtenances and relocated their programs to the new building. In doing so, they left what is essentially a warehouse. A three-year attempt to develop this building as a university-wide research facility failed because of a lack of funds to initiate and sustain it.

Building 04 has now been made available to the School of Engineering as an applied research and development facility. Since the research activities in the ARDFA facility have no ongoing instructional program to use as a base for the development and maintenance of its research facilities, and funds are needed to make it operational and sustain its activity, it is proposed that the indirect costs recovered from Foundation ARDFA Sponsored Projects be used in assisting ARDFA development. In order for the School of Engineering to properly use the building for the purposes intended, funds are required to renovate and install equipment which can be used for research grants and contracts, and to maintain overhead for direct project costs.

The Campus Administrative Manual places limitations and restrictions on the use of overhead for direct project costs: "Because indirect costs are real expenses, funds recovered through indirect costs reimbursement are not available to provide additional
support for the direct expenses of a project" (CAM 543.1). It does not, however, restrict the use of indirect costs for overhead type activities such as general equipment purchase, equipment maintenance, and operational costs. This resolution proposes another way of treating indirect costs consistent with the current policies in CAM.

RESOLUTION ON CAM 543 REGARDING INDIRECT COST SHARING (ARDFA FACILITIES)

WHEREAS, Indirect cost recovery is intended to assist the university in the development and maintenance of research facilities; and

WHEREAS, The State currently allocates no direct dollars to support research facilities; and

WHEREAS, The current overhead sharing plan does not allow for advances to a grant or a contract to assist in the development of facilities; and

WHEREAS, The current guidelines for CARE grants recognizes the development of research facilities as an important method for encouraging research on campus; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the concept that up to 40 percent of the indirect costs recovered on Foundation Sponsored Projects using the applied research and development facility exclusively, may be utilized for the development, operation, and maintenance of the facility. This concept will be an administrative exception to the Campus Administrative Manual Section 543 for a three-year trial period with annual review by the Research Committee. The concept should ensure that the committee receives from the projects utilizing the ARDFA facility a percentage proportional share for CARE grants not less than the percentage of total campus indirect costs allocated for CARE grants in AY 1988-1989, that is not less than the percentage allocated for CARE grants from the total indirect costs recovered by the university in the previous Academic Year.

Proposed By: Research Committee
July 18, 1989
Revised: October 12, 1989
Indirect costs are defined by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) as those costs incurred in the development, administration, and running of sponsored programs that go over and above the direct costs of any specific project. These costs include expenses for space and facilities, office and laboratory equipment, maintenance, utilities, library use, accounting functions, departmental and school administration, university administration, and program development, as they are incurred on government and privately sponsored research, development, instructional, training, service, and demonstration projects.

The indirect cost rate is negotiated periodically with the DHHS and changes to reflect shifts in costs. Project developers should consult the Grants Development Office to determine current rates before discussing indirect costs with prospective sponsors.

543.1 Policy on Indirect Cost Recovery

The university will seek full indirect costs reimbursement for each sponsored activity, whether administered through the university or through the Foundation. Because indirect costs are real expenses, funds recovered through indirect costs reimbursement are not available to provide additional support for the direct expenses of a project.

543.2 Utilization of Indirect Funds

As indirect cost reimbursements for projects administered fiscally either by the university or by the Foundation are accumulated, they may be utilized by the respective business offices to pay for the financial administration of the projects according to the approved rate. All other funds shall be placed in appropriate Foundation or university trust accounts designated "Unallocated Overhead," which is to be used for covering associated costs as well as for sharing throughout the university.

543.3 Report on Expenditure of Indirect Costs and Proposed Utilization

At the beginning of each fiscal year (or more frequently if required), the Associate Vice President Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development in cooperation with the Vice President for Business Affairs and the Foundation Executive Director will develop a summary statement that will include the following:

A. Indirect cost income during previous fiscal year, including any balance of unused indirect costs reimbursements remaining in the trust accounts.

B. Charges during the previous fiscal year for:
   1. University fiscal administration
   2. Foundation fiscal administration and reserves

C. The Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development will use the above statement as the basis for developing a proposal for the use of unallocated overheads during the current year. The proposal will be developed in consultation with the Academic Senate Research Committee. Its objective shall be to fund adequately each of the following in priority:
   1. Supplementary budget support for the Grants Development Office;
   2. Reserve for program development/contingency; and

Revised June 1988
3. Uncommitted funds for use by the university, including funds remaining after the termination of fixed-price contracts.

The above summary statement and proposal will be reviewed and endorsed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and sent to the President for approval.

543.4 Policy for Maintenance and Utilization of Reserve for Program Development/Contingency

The goal of the reserve for program development/contingency is a level sufficient to assure adequate resources for the continuing support of the grants development activity. Its use will be restricted generally to costs associated with major proposal development or grant negotiation and to reserves necessary to ensure continuity in funding for the Grants Development Office. Recommendations for expenditures are made by the Director of Grants Development and approved by the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development.

543.5 Policy for Allocating Uncommitted Indirect Cost Reimbursements

Uncommitted overhead funds approved for allocation will be distributed in the following manner and for the following purposes.

Fifty percent of uncommitted indirect cost reimbursements will be available to the Academic Senate Research Committee, which will solicit proposals from the faculty for research, development, and other scholarly and creative activities and recommend grants subject to the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The program under which the Academic Senate Research Committee recommends proposals to the Vice President for Academic Affairs is called CARE, for Creative Activity/Research Effort.

Forty percent of the uncommitted overhead will go to the administrative unit directly sponsoring the project (e.g., department, dean's office, institute, or center). These funds are not discretionary, but are restricted funds, intended to be used to reinforce and foster such activities as those that led to the grant that earned them, including additional support to the individual project investigators. Ten percent will go to the individual project director for professional development activities.

544 Patent Policy and Procedures

The university, by its very nature has an obligation to serve the public interest. In order to do this effectively, it is necessary that the university have a patent program which will make inventions arising in the course of university research available to the public interest under conditions that will promote effective development and utilization.

The university also recognizes its need to assist faculty and staff members of the university in all matters related to patents based on discoveries and inventions developed in situations such as those in which the university has no vested interest, i.e., those which are developed by a faculty or staff member on personal time and without the use of university facilities.

Revised June 1988
Figure A

Average Project
Direct and Indirect Costs
Recovered 1987/88
$118,000

INDIRECT COSTS
$18,000

DIRECT COSTS
$100,000
Overhead Distribution, Average Project
1987/88
$118,000

CARE $1,000
Dept $800
P.I. $200

$2,000 Shortfall
$3,000 Grants Development

$11,000 Foundation
Sponsored Programs
Administration

Indirect Costs
$18,000

Direct Costs
$100,000
Average ARDFA Project
Proposed Distribution
(1989/90)
$122,000

$1,000 CARE (5%)
$2,200 Grants Development (10%)
$9,900 Foundation Sponsored Programs (45%)
$8,800 ARDFA (40%)

Indirect Costs
$22,000

Direct Costs
$100,000
WHEREAS,  
No uniform policy exists when a request to change  
the name of a department is made; therefore, be it  
RESOLVED:  
That the following policy and procedure on changes  
of department names be approved by the Academic  
Senate of Cal Poly:  

1. A department requesting a change of its name  
will send the request, in writing, to the  
dean of the school with an explanation of the  
reasons for the change.  

2. The dean will receive recommendations on the  
request from the school council and Academic  
Senate school caucus, add her/his own  
recommendation, and send the request with the  
recommendations to the Vice President for  
Academic Affairs.  

3. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will  
ask for a recommendation on the proposed name  
change from the Academic Senate and from the  
Academic Deans' Council.  

4. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will  
approve or disapprove the proposed name  
change after considering the recommendations  
of the school council and the dean of the  
affected school, the Academic Senate, and the  
Academic Deans' Council.  

Proposed By:  
Academic Senate Executive  
Committee  
Date: October 10, 1989
Re: Resolution on Evaluation Procedures and Criteria

(Agenda page 21) second paragraph of CAM 341.A.7 - change to read:

When recommendations at other levels of review are not in conformity with the recommendations of the department PRC, a full explanation of the reasons for the contrary recommendation shall be conveyed, in writing, to the department PRC by the first level of review at which the contrary recommendation is made.

(Agenda page 21) CAM 341.A.9 - change to read:

Deans shall use the Faculty Evaluation Form (Form 109) to evaluate faculty for retention, tenure, and promotion, as shall the heads/chairs of departments in which they are a separate level of review. Comments regarding student evaluations must be included in Section 1 of Form 109.