Adopted: November 16,2004

ACADEMIC SENATE of CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-626-04

RESOLUTION ON REVISION TO THE BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE TO UPDATE THE PROCEDURES FOR THE FACULTY DISPUTE REVIEW COMMITTEE

1 2 3	WHEREAS,	The Faculty Dispute Review committee was charged with creating procedures to implement a faculty dispute process consistent with the document below; therefore, be it
4 5 6	RESOLVED:	That the <i>Bylaws of the Academic Senate</i> be revised as follows:
7 8	1. CC	OMMITTEE DESCRIPTIONS
9 10	5.	Faculty Dispute Review Committee
11		b. Responsibilities
12 13		The committee shall develop procedures appropriate to its functions and shall make periodic reports of its activities to the Academic Senate and to
14		the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. FOI all disputes that fall
15		within its jurisdiction, the Faculty Dispute Review Committee shall have
16		the authority to conduct an investigation of the dispute and to make
17		recommendations to the ProvostNice President for Academic Affairs. The
18		procedures to be followed shall be approved by the Academic Senate and
19 20		published as a document entitled Faculty Dispute Review Committee Procedures. Changes in the document shall be approved by the Senate;
21		170ceaures. Changes in the document shan be approved by the senate,
22		and be it further
23		
24	RESOLVED:	That the Faculty Dispute Review Committee Procedures be approved as follows:
25		
26		Preamble/Charge
27		e represents a resource where faculty can have disputes reviewed by peers for a
28		commendation. Faculty includes full time and part time teaching faculty,
29 30	Professional Consultative Services, and department chairs/heads. The committee was formed to	
31	address disputes between faculty members which cannot be resolved by other means, deals with disputes between/among faculty members only, and attempts to reach equitable resolution.	
32	•	I make every attempt at informal resolution prior to appealing to this committee.
33	•	efore the committee is voluntary and proceedings are kept confidential by

34	committee members. The committee recognizes the obligation to report any illegal activity. The
<u>35</u>	authority of this Academic Senate committee is limited as a recommending body to the Provost.
36	The committee does not deal with decisions or questions of professional review.
37	
38	MembershiplTerms/Chair/Quorum
39	The Faculty Dispute Review Committee shall consist of seven (7) tenured faculty members
40	appointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate fur a two year term and
41	representing each of the colleges and Professional Consultative Services. The Faculty Dispute
42	Review Committee shall consist of one tenured faculty member from each college and one
43	representative from Professional Consultative Services, appointed by the Executive Committee
44	of the Academic Senate for staggered two year terms. The Faculty Dispute Review Committee
45	chair shall be a member of the General Faculty and shall be appointed in accordance with Article
46	VIILC of the Bylaws a/the Academic Senate. A quorum shall consist of five voting committee
47	members. The committee may invite various consultants to attend to provide advice on
48	University policies and procedures.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Dispute Review Committee

Date: June 21, 2004

Revised: October 24, 2004 Revised: October 27,2004

Memorandum



SAN LUIS OBISPO

CA 93407

To: David Hannings

Chair, Academic Senate

Date:

Copies:

December 10,2004

R. Detweiler

From: Warren J. Baker

President

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-625-04

Resolution on Revision to the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate* to Update the Responsibilities

for the Research and Professional Development Committee

Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-626-04

Resolution on Revision to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate to Update the Procedures for the

Faculty Dispute Review Committee

I acknowledge receipt of the above-entitled Academic Senate Resolutions and agree that the changes more clearly identify the committees' responsibilities.