I. Minutes: Approval of the February 24, 1987 Senate Minutes (attached pp. 2-5).

II. Communications:
B. Response of Instruction Committee to question of Revision of Change of Grade Form (attached pp. 6-7).
C. Bachelor of Science with a major in Computer Engineering (attached p. 8).

III. Reports:
A. President’s Office
B. Academic Affairs Office
C. Statewide Senators

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:
A. Resolution on the Budgetary Process [in four parts]-Conway, Chair of the Budget Committee, Second Reading (attached pp. 9-15).
B. Resolution on Cheating and Plagiarism-Beardsley, Chair of the Fairness Board Committee/Stebbins, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, Second Reading (attached pp. 16-17).
C. Resolution on Retention of Exams and Student Access to Same-Beardsley, Chair of the Fairness Board Committee/Stebbins, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, Second Reading (attached pp. 18-19).
D. Resolution on Fairness Board Description and Procedures-Beardsley, Chair of the Fairness Board Committee/Stebbins, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, First Reading (attached pp. 20-24).
E. Proposed Program Change Proposals and Ranking-Conway, Chair of the Budget Committee, First Reading (attached pp. 25-28).
F. Proposed Revision of Master Plan Statement on Scholarship-Executive Committee, First Reading (attached p. 29).

VI. Discussion:

VII. Adjournment:
Staff Council will sponsor the Poly Vue Pancake Breakfast on April 4.

3. Academic Senate Committee Reports
   a. AA-002-856, Grade Change Procedures

   M/s/p to receive and file.

   M/s to adopt the report.

   Committee Chair Clark presented the report.

   Recommendations

   1. Revise the "Change of Grade" form to clearly indicate that only the instructor of record can submit this form.

   2. When circumstances necessitate that a grade change occur without the signature of the instructor of record, the change of grade form must be accompanied by a memo to the Records Office. This memo shall be signed by the School Dean, the Department Chairman and a Department Faculty, and shall state the reason for the absence of the instructor of record's signature. The University Manual should be changed to indicate this.

   The recommended revised change of grade form is below.

   **CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA 10828**

   **CHANGE OF GRADE**

   CHANGE OF GRADE FORMS WILL BE ACCEPTED DIRECTLY FROM INSTRUCTOR ONLY.

   THIS FORM MUST BE SUBMITTED WITHIN ONE QUARTER OF ORIGINAL GRADE AWARD.

   Please change the grade of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT'S NAME</th>
<th>(P.I.N.)</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE CODE</th>
<th>DEPT. &amp; NO.</th>
<th>COURSE TITLE</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   In: from to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUARTER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   For: (NAME OF INSTRUCTOR OF RECORD) (DATE)

   TIME INDICATING - PLEASE PRINT

   TIME INDICATING - SIGNATURE

   Reason for Change:

   **COPY DISTRIBUTION AFTER POSTING**

   1. Permanent folder
   2. Major Dept. Head (Advisor)
   3. Instructor
   4. Student

   F-916-00 (POSTED BY) (DATE)

   * FOR ANY EXCEPTION, REFER TO UNIVERSITY MANUAL.
Discussion - The opinion was expressed that the addition of another faculty member to the grade change process is adding another level of bureaucracy. This imposes on the Department Chairman who has faculty teaching on campus for one quarter only. There are times when there is no way of contacting the faculty member and the Chairman has an unhappy student requesting a grade change. We should not add an additional faculty member as part of the process.

The point was made that the addition of the faculty member in the bureaucratic structure will discourage lightly made grade changes. Unless there are compelling reasons the instructor's grade should stand.

A request was made that in recommendation 2. "Chairman" be changed to "Chair".

The point was made that we should protect the instructor who assigned the grade.

The question was called.

The motion passed.

b. EPC-001-867, Behavioral Sciences Department 1987-88 Social Sciences Teaching Material

M/s/p to receive and file the report.

M/s to adopt the report.

Dr. Teague presented the report.

Recommendations

1. Approve a single subjects waiver program in the Behavioral Sciences major:

Core requirements in subjects commonly taught:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Prerequisites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. S. History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 201 U. S. History</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 202 U. S. History</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U. S. Government</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLS 201 Introduction to American Government</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLS 320 Political Change in Contemporary America</td>
<td>4 PLS 201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 20, 1987

Dr. Malcolm W. Wilson
Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

Dear Malcolm:

This is to inform you that the proposal for the Bachelor of Science with a major in Computer Engineering has been forwarded to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) for review and comment. We appreciate the information you sent in response to our questions and the revised pages of the proposal.

The CPEC staff have up to sixty days to comment on this proposed program. We will let you know the results of their evaluation. If endorsed, the program will be authorized for implementation in Fall, 1987.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Anthony J. Moye
Associate Vice Chancellor
Educational Programs and Resources

cc: Dr. Glenn Irvin
Dr. Janice Erskine

XC: Peter Hee
Jim Harris
Dan Stubbs
Lloyd Lamovia
Chuck Dana
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Jim Conway, Chair Academic Senate Budget Committee

Subject: Proposed Budgetary Process Model for Cal Poly

The Budget Committee at its meeting on Thursday, February 5, 1987, unanimously H/S/P that the attached resolutions, prepared by the Budgetary Process Subcommittee be forwarded to the Chair of the Academic Senate as a final report for action by the Executive Committee and the full Academic Senate.

Attachment(1)
RESOLUTIONS CONCERNING THE BUDGETARY PROCESS

BACKGROUND STATEMENT

In a memorandum dated December 13, 1984, the Chancellor transmitted the Board of Trustee's policy that committees which include faculty and students should exist to advise the President on budget policy, planning, and resource allocation. The memorandum stated the policy in the following way. "Insure that committees which include students, faculty, and any other appropriate constituency exist at each of the campuses and at the system level to advise the Presidents and Chancellor, respectively, on budget policy, planning and resource allocation." This policy involved the total budget of the campus as well as the resource allocations of all programs.

For several years the Budget Committee of the Academic Senate has tried to develop a formal procedure by which faculty input into the budgeting process at Cal Poly could be achieved. The resolutions on the budgetary process, that comprise this package, are the outgrowth of over a year and a half of meetings of a Budgetary Process Subcommittee of the Academic Senate Budget Committee, which included a representative from the Academic Affairs Office. The resolutions concerning the Budget Process and Instructional Program Resources are presented for approval by the Academic Senate. This approval would constitute an endorsement of two committees, The President's Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocation, and the Advisory Committee on Instructional Resources, that have already been created, are functioning, and have Academic Senate representation.

Attached to this resolution package is a flowchart showing how the various campus entities and newly proposed committees would fit into the University's organizational structure. The role of the Academic Senate Budget Committee, as presented in the bylaws, would remain essentially unchanged. It would still be primarily a policy body involved in providing input where there are proposed changes in allocation models, and in making sure that budget information concerning allocations and expenditures made by schools and departmentally is made available to the faculty.

It is the belief of the Academic Senate Budget Committee that integrally related to the issue of resource allocation are the twin concepts of Long Range Planning and Program Evaluation. Because of this belief, two additional resolutions dealing with Long Range Planning and Program Evaluation, directed to the Long Range Planning Committee for action, are submitted as part of this package.
WHEREAS, The resource allocation process should be an open and formal process; and
WHEREAS, The faculty, staff, and students of the university should be permitted input into the budgetary process prior to the approval of the allocation of the university budget; therefore, be it
RESOLVED: That the President's Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocation shall be charged with recommending to the President allocation of resources to university program areas; and be it further
RESOLVED: That the President's Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocation shall be charged with recommending to the President policies and procedures to implement this allocation process; and be it further
RESOLVED: That no allocation requests shall be submitted to the President without previously having been submitted to the President's Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocation; and be it further
RESOLVED: That the allocation process shall strive to allow sufficient time for consultation with the Deans' Council, the Academic Senate, and the ASI; and be it further
RESOLVED: That periodic reports of the President's Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocation shall be made available to the President's Council, the Deans' Council, the Academic Senate, and the ASI; and be it further
RESOLVED: That agenda, minutes, and copies of full recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocation be provided to the Chair of the Academic Senate and to the members of the Academic Senate Budget Committee concurrently with the members of the President's Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocation; and be it further
RESOLVED: That the membership of the President's Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocation shall consist of:

- Vice President, Academic Affairs
- Vice President, Business Affairs (Chair)
- Vice President, Information Systems
- Chair, Academic Senate or designee
- Dean of Student Affairs
- Executive Dean, Facilities Administration
- President, Associated Students Incorporated (ASI) or designee

Staff support will be provided by the Associate Vice President for Academic Resources, the Budget Office, the Associate Dean of Student Affairs, and other personnel as might be required.

Proposed By:
Budget Committee
February 17, 1987
WHEREAS, The instructional program resource allocation process should be an open and formal process; and

WHEREAS, The faculty, staff, and students of the university should be permitted input into this process prior to the approval of the allocation of the university budget; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Advisory Committee on Instructional Program Resources shall be charged with recommending to the Vice President for Academic Affairs allocation of resources to instructional programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Advisory Committee on Instructional Program Resources shall be charged with recommending to the Vice President for Academic Affairs policies and procedures to implement this process; and be it further

RESOLVED: That all requests for use of resources allocated by the President to instruction shall be submitted to the Advisory Committee on Instructional Program Resources; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this allocation process shall strive to allow sufficient time for consultation with the Deans' Council, the Academic Senate, and the ASI; and be it further

RESOLVED: That agenda, minutes, and copies of full recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Instructional Program Resources be provided to the Chair of the Academic Senate and to the members of the Academic Senate Budget Committee concurrently with the members of the Advisory Committee on Instructional Program Resources; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the membership of the Advisory Committee on Instructional Program Resources shall consist of:

- Vice President for Business Affairs or designee
- Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (Chair)
- Associate Vice President for Academic Resources
- Chair, Academic Senate or designee
- President, Associated Students Incorporated (ASI) or designee

Proposed By:
Budget Committee
February 17, 1987
WHEREAS, Long-range planning is an integral part of university planning and resource allocation; and

WHEREAS, There is a need to develop a more formal unified campus long-range planning process; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee be charged to recommend policies and procedures for the implementation of a long-range planning process which links planning and resource allocation within the university; and be it further

RESOLVED: That these recommended policies and procedures be subject to approval by the Academic Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED: That these recommended policies and procedures be subject to approval by the President; and be it further

RESOLVED: That any reports concerning long-range planning shall be made available to the President’s Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocation, the Advisory Committee on Instructional Program Resources and other committees as necessary.

Proposed By:
Budget Committee
February 17, 1987
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS——86/____

RESOLUTION ON
PROGRAM EVALUATION

WHEREAS, Program evaluations should be an integral part of university planning and resource allocation; and

WHEREAS, The current process is not an integral part of university planning and resource allocation; therefore, be it;

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee be charged to recommend policies and procedures for the implementation of an evaluation process which links program evaluation with planning; and be it further

RESOLVED: That these recommended policies and procedures be subject to approval by the Academic Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED: That these recommended policies and procedures be subject to approval by the President; and be it further

RESOLVED: That these program evaluations be made available to the President's Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocation, the Advisory Committee on Instructional Program Resources, and other committees as necessary.

Proposed By:
Budget Committee
February 17, 1987
WHEREAS, The present CAM policy on cheating is extremely short and lacks definition; and

WHEREAS, There are differences from department to department regarding the definition and handling of cheating offenses; and

WHEREAS, It would be desirable to add further language regarding plagiarism to the CAM policy; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the present guidelines on cheating (CAM 674) be modified as outlined below:

674 Cheating

674.1 First offense for cheating is an "F" course grade, and further attendance in that class is prohibited. A report in writing including evidence must be made by the instructor to the department head. The department head will notify the Dean of Students of the action taken.

674.2 Second reported offense is considered sufficient cause for the initiation of disciplinary action in accordance with the current Student Disciplinary Procedures of The California State University and Colleges.

674.3 A student wishing to challenge the course instructor's decision that a cheating offense has been committed may appeal to the head of the department in which the course is offered, the dean of the school, and ultimately to the Fairness Board for a hearing in accordance with procedural due process. This is a committee of the Academic Senate; see Appendix XI for details of procedures.

674.1 Definition of Cheating. Cheating is defined as obtaining or attempting to obtain, or aiding another to obtain, credit for work, or any improvement in evaluation of performance, by any dishonest or deceptive means. Cheating includes, but is not limited to: lying; copying from another's test or examination; discussion of answers or ideas relating to the answers on an examination or test, unless such discussion is specifically authorized by the instructor; taking or receiving copies of an exam without the permission of the instructor; using or displaying notes, "cheat sheets," or other information devices inappropriate to the prescribed test conditions; allowing someone other than the officially enrolled student to represent same.
Definition of Plagiarism. Plagiarism is defined as the act of using the ideas or work of another person or persons as if they were one’s own, without giving credit to the source. Such an act is not plagiarism if it is ascertained that the ideas were arrived at through independent reasoning or logic or where the thought or idea is common knowledge.

Acknowledgement of an original author or source must be made through appropriate references; i.e., quotation marks, footnotes, or commentary. Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to, the following: the submission of a work, either in part or in whole, completed by another; failure to give credit for ideas, statements, facts or conclusions which rightfully belong to another; failure to use quotation marks when quoting directly from another, whether it be a paragraph, a sentence, or even a part thereof; close and lengthy paraphrasing of another's writing or programming without credit or originality.

Policy on Cheating. Cheating requires an "F" Course grade and further attendance in the course is prohibited. The instructor is obligated to place evidence of the cheating in writing before the Dean of Students with copies to the department head of the course involved, to the student, and to the department head of the student’s major. Physical evidence, circumstantial evidence, and testimony of observation may be included. Said memorandum should notify the student that an appeal is possible through the Fairness Board.

Instructors should be diligent in reducing potential opportunities for cheating to occur.

In the event that the Dean of Students identifies a student to be guilty of more than one cheating offense, this shall be considered sufficient cause for the initiation of disciplinary action.

Policy on Plagiarism. Plagiarism may be considered a form of cheating and subject to the same policy described in Section 674.3 above. However, as there may be a fine line between plagiarism and editorship with poor attention to format, some instructor discretion is appropriate. In the event of plagiarism, an instructor may choose to counsel the student and offer a remedy which is less severe than that required for cheating, providing there was no obvious intent to deceive. However, an instructor may not penalize a student for plagiarism in any way without advising the student that a penalty has been imposed. An appeal is possible through the Fairness Board.

Proposed By:
Student Affairs Committee/
Fairness Board Committee
February 17, 1987
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Background statement: During the 1985/86 academic year, the Fairness Board was asked to
draft policies on retention of exams by faculty, and student access to exams and other
evaluation instruments. At present, there are no provisions within CAM regarding these
topics.

AS—-86/—

RESOLUTION ON
RETENTION OF EXAMS AND STUDENT ACCESS TO SAME

WHEREAS, Students have occasionally experienced problems in the past gaining access
to exams and other evaluation instruments; and

WHEREAS, Faculty currently have no formal obligations as far as retention of
evaluation materials; and

WHEREAS, It would be desirable to have a uniform policy on the campus, for the sake of
fairness and resolution of any student/faculty disagreement; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the policy listed below be added to the appropriate section of CAM:

### Retention of Exams and Other Evaluation Instruments

#### 1 Faculty Responsibilities Regarding Retention of Exams and Other Evaluation Instruments

Exams, papers, projects, or other tangible items used in the
evaluation of students need not be retained by the instructor
beyond the end of the term of evaluation, if there was an
announced opportunity for students to retrieve same during
the term.

For final exams or other evaluation instruments where no
announced opportunity for student review existed before the
end of the term, instructors should retain the materials for
one full quarter. While special situations may arise requiring
deviation from this goal, instructors will be responsible to
defend any deviation in the event of a subsequent review of a
student's evaluation.

#### 2 Student Access to Evaluation Instruments

Upon request, instructors should offer students access to all
exams, papers, projects or other items used in evaluation
which have been retained by the instructor. (See policy on
retention, Section above). At the discretion of the
instructor, access may be restricted, such as permitting access
only in the instructor's presence during office hours.
RESOLUTION ON RETENTION OF EXAMS
AND STUDENT ACCESS TO SAME
AS-87/

Page Two

In the event of a student grade grievance, the Fairness Board shall be given access to available evaluation instruments.

Proposed By:
Fairness Board Committee/
Student Affairs Committee
February 17, 1987
Background statement: The Academic Senate Fairness Board Committee has revised its Description and Procedures statement to accurately reflect the current process. This is the first formal revision since 1979.

AS-____-86/____

RESOLUTION ON
FAIRNESS BOARD DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES

WHEREAS, The present CAM description of the Fairness Board needs to be updated to reflect changes in process and procedures; and

RESOLVED: That Appendix XI, Fairness Board Description and Procedures be modified as attached.

Proposed By:
The Fairness Board Committee
and Student Affairs Committee
On March 3, 1987
FAIRNESS BOARD
Description and Procedures

Description
The Fairness Board (see CAM Appendix VII, p. 41 XI) is the primary campus group concerned with providing "due process" of academically related matters for the students and instructors at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, particularly in terms of student/faculty relationships. The Board hears grade appeals based on the grievant's belief that the instructor has made a mistake, shown bad faith or incompetence, or been unfair. (For cheating, see CAM 674.3) However, the Board may also hear cases involving student/administration or student/student relationships of an academic nature.

Although in grade appeals the Board operates under the presumption that the grade assigned was correct, should its members find that the evidence indicates that such was not actually the case, the chair will recommend to the Vice President for Academic Affairs that the grade be changed. In all cases, the Board's authority is limited to actions consistent with other campus and CSUE system policy.

Procedures
A. Any student who still feels aggrieved after failing to receive relief from both the person allegedly causing the problem and that person's immediate supervisor(s) (e.g., faculty member, faculty member's department head, and faculty member's school dean) instructor and instructor's department head, may initiate an appeal for redress by writing a letter requesting a hearing to the chair of the Fairness Board. The chair may counsel a student as to the relative merit of his/her case, but must accept all written complaints which are ultimately submitted. The chair will provide the student with a copy of "Fairness Board Description and Procedures." The student's letter should contain all pertinent details of the issue(s) raised, name persons involved, list witnesses, list exhibits, and situation, name of the course, section, instructor and term in question, list any witnesses to be called, state redress sought, and include as attachments all relevant documents, including items such as course grade determination handout, exams, papers, letters of support, etc. The student has the responsibility of identifying evidence to however, the student should understand that in all cases he/she must overcome the Board's presumption that the instructor's action was correct. If the Board decides the case may have merit, then he following actions will then take place:

1. The chair will forward a copy of the above letter to the challenged party and request his/her written reply to the chair within one week of receipt. The chair will share a copy of any reply with the student grievant. The Chair will also send a copy of "Fairness Board Description and Procedures" to the challenged party.

2. The chair will make scheduling arrangements as soon as possible for the hearing which will be conducted informally. At least six Board members, including at least one student, must be present before a hearing may begin, and the same six members and one student must be present for the full hearing.

3. When a hearing is scheduled, the chair will notify the Board's members and the two principal parties.

4. It is expected that Board members will disqualify themselves from voting participation in any case if they are a principal or if they feel they cannot be impartial.
The Board will allow each principal party, who may be accompanied by his/her advisor, (not a practicing attorney of law) to present his/her case personally, call and question witnesses, and present exhibits. The Board may ask for copies of any material it believes relevant to the hearing. The student grievant will usually appear first.

Each Board member may ask questions of either party or any witness.

The Board itself may call witnesses or recall witnesses.

The Board will handle all proceedings without undue delay, will keep a summary file of each case, and will tape record the hearing.

The Board will close the hearing when satisfied that both sides have been fully heard.

The Board will deliberate in private and will make a written summarization of the facts of the case and of the Board’s reasoning in its recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The chair will send a copy of its recommendation to each principal party, to the instructor’s department, and to each Board member.

Should any member(s) of the Board desire to file a minority recommendation, he/she may do so by sending it to the chair, who will forward copies to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, to each principal party, and to each Board member. It will be attached to the Board’s majority recommendation.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs will inform the Board and each principal party what action, if any, has been taken. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall have final decision regarding any grade change, but if the recommendation of the Fairness Board is not accepted, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall indicate the reason(s) why in writing to the Board.

The hearings are closed to all persons except the Board and the two principal parties and advisors. Witnesses, if any, shall be present only when testifying. No testimony shall be taken outside the hearing room, but writings written statements from persons unable to attend are admissible. Exceptions to these rules are possible if the Board and both principals have no objections.

In the event a situation arises wherein the Board unanimously deems the above rules inappropriate, the Board will modify its procedures to insure that fairness and justice prevail.

Membership
One tenured faculty member from each school, and one tenured member from Student Affairs, all appointed by the chair of the Academic Senate for two-year terms. One two or three student members selected by ASI, with no less than junior standing and three consecutive quarters of attendance at Cal Poly preceding appointment. In the event that any member is unavailable to participate, that individual member is asked to identify someone as a substitute who can continue through the entire case. The Fairness Board chair is elected by the Board.
Unresolved problem exists between student and the University

Student is strongly urged to go to the Counseling Center for purpose of defining, clarifying and achieving utmost objectivity regarding problem. "A problem clearly seen and stated is half solved" as the old saying goes.

Student and/or the faculty representative takes the problem through appropriate line channels** for resolution

Student feels that problem has not been properly understood or resolved

Student formulates a written complaint

a. States complaint
b. Gives background of details
c. Indicates witnesses that may be called
d. Attaches relevant documents

Submits to any member of the Fairness Board

Fairness Board reviews complaint and declares the complaint to have:

**MERIT**

Board hears plaintiff and defendant.
If a resolution of problem occurs, Fairness Board Hearing ceases.

**NO MERIT**

Student and/or faculty representative may rebut with new evidence

If complaint is unresolved, Fairness Board will recommend action to the President of the University

**EXAMPLE OF LINE CHANNELS:**

Instructor
Adviser
Department Head
Dean of School
Etc.

**MEMBERSHIP OF FAIRNESS BOARD:**

One tenured faculty member from each school, and one tenured member from Student Affairs, all appointed by chair of Academic Senate for two-year terms. One student member selected by ASI, with no less than junior standing and three quarters consecutive attendance at Cal Poly preceding appointment. Chair is elected by the Board.

NOTE: Complaints regarding race, creed, color or sex are to be referred to Discrimination Study Committee.

Adopted by Cal Poly Academic Senate on 4-18-69.
Revised March, 1973 to reflect name change to university.
Revised October, 1975 to reflect general membership rather than individuals.
ACADEMIC SENATE FAIRNESS BOARD PROCESS

Unresolved problem exists between student and the university

Student is encouraged to go to the Counseling Center and to his/her advisor for the purpose of defining and clarifying the problem and achieving objectivity.

Student attempts to resolve the problem with appropriate party (e.g., instructor of record) and appropriate line of authority (e.g., instructor’s department head).

Student feels that problem has not been resolved and consults with the chair of the Fairness Board.

Student prepares a letter to the Fairness Board indicating his/her problem and submits it to the Board’s chair. The letter should:

(a) identify the course, section, term, and instructor of record
(b) state complaint and redress sought
(c) indicate witnesses that may be called
(d) include copies of relevant documents such as course grade determination handout, exams, papers, statements of support made by others, etc.

Fairness Board reviews complaint and declares complaint to have:

MERIT
Board requests written response from instructor and schedules a hearing. If a resolution to the problem presents itself, the hearing may be terminated. If no resolution seems satisfactory to the Board and the principals, the hearing will lead to the Board making a recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

NO MERIT
Student may rebut with new evidence.

MERIT  NO MERIT

First adopted by the Academic Senate on 4/18/69. Revised 3/73, 10/75, and 2/87.
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Jim Conway, Chair
       Academic Senate Budget Committee

Subject: Proposed Program Change Proposals and Ranking

The Budget Committee is forwarding the attached ranking of Program Change Proposals to you for further consideration by you, the executive committee, and the full senate, if there is time. All of the PCPS have been submitted before, except one, Instructional Equipment Maintenance Augmentation. The detail on all the PCPS can be found in last year's submission package. Attached to this memo you will find a copy of the detailed statement for the number one ranked PCP, which originated in the Budget Committee last year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS AND RANKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSAL**

**INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY STAFFING AUGMENTATION (Four Parts)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Increase the percent of actual mode and level allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Sabbatical Leaves - Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Substitute Faculty - Reinstatement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACULTY DEVELOPMENT (Three Parts)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Classroom Computer Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Leave Replacements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Travel and Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACADEMIC COMPUTING AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS - STUDENT/FACULTY (Two Parts)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Phase I - Student Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Phase II - Faculty Access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTRUCTIONAL EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE AUGMENTATION**

**MINORITY UNDERREPRESENTATION AND TEACHING IMPROVEMENT**

**LEARNING DISABLED**

**RURAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT**

**LEARNING ASSISTANCE CENTER SERVICES**

*The concrete aspects of this proposal were not in written form at the time it was considered. Additional material is to be provided by the Academic Affairs office via Frank Lebens. Tentative approval pending further documentation.*
Title of Proposal: Instructional Faculty Staffing Augmentation & Graduate Studies

Systemwide or Campus PCP: Systemwide PCP

Description of Proposal:

This proposal requests funding for four components to supplement existing faculty staffing levels, to reestablish the Substitute Faculty allocation, and to establish a new budget to more adequately recognize the workload associated with graduate programs. A detailed description of these four components follows.

A. Instructional Faculty Staffing Augmentation - Systemwide PCP to improve faculty staffing above the current level which provides 92.7% of the Mode & Level staffing formula. Enrichment of the student/faculty ratio could also be achieved by modernizing the course classification system to: recognize changes in pedagogy over the past 18 years; to adjust the SFR to recognize class size limits imposed by the size of current facilities; and to establish class size limits for effective health and safety related supervision of students.

Graduate Studies - Apart from the mode-and-level faculty allocation model the CSU currently does not adequately distinguish between undergraduate and graduate instructional programs. In accordance with the current CSU Mission Statement, which identifies graduate studies as a focal area for increased development and emphasis, the proposed program would require recognition of the special support needs of graduate programs in the following areas:

(a) Supplies, services and equipment
(b) Reduced faculty teaching loads
(c) Graduate teaching assistantships

It is proposed that the current budget allocation model for supplies, services and equipment be modified to reflect the support requirements of graduate research projects, particularly in Engineering, Science, Agriculture and Architecture.

In respect to item (b) it is proposed that the CSU reinstate the teaching load differential which existed prior to the 'Proposition 13' budget cuts in recent years.

Finally, it is proposed that Graduate Teaching Assistantships be recognized as a separate funding item essential to the delivery of quality graduate programs.

C. Sabbatical Leaves Augmentation - The current sabbatical leaves allocation model is not sensitive to several factors which negatively impact the availability of sabbatical leaves as a major faculty professional development and renewal program.

First, an inequity currently exists between CSU campuses that operate on a quarter system and those that operate on a semester system, in terms of the existing remuneration formula.
In other words, the current formula of full-pay, two-thirds pay and one-half pay does not distinguish between the time unit differences between an academic quarter and a semester.

Secondly, the remuneration formula itself is inadequate and subjects faculty who are awarded sabbatical leaves to financial hardship.

Thirdly, in the absence of adequate faculty staffing formulas, particularly small instructional departments are finding it difficult to provide replacements for faculty on sabbatical leave.

It is proposed to alleviate the unfavorable conditions which currently impact sabbatical leaves as follows:

a. Modify the sabbatical leave funding model to eliminate the current remuneration differential between sabbatical leaves based on the quarter and semester organizational time limits.

b. Augment the sabbatical leave funding allocation to decrease the existing margin between a faculty member's normal salary and the remuneration level for a two-semester, two-quarter or three-quarter sabbatical leave. Ideally, the level would be increased to one year at full salary. At a minimum the funding formula should be redefined to provide for the first quarter at full pay, the second quarter at two-thirds pay and the third quarter at one-half pay (i.e., instead of applying the remuneration level to the entire sabbatical leave period).

c. Provide adequate funding for sabbatical leave replacement positions.

D. Substitute Faculty - This component would establish an allocation in the Instruction Program for payments to Substitute Faculty. In FY 1981/82 the PMP standard that provided 1.0 substitute faculty per 1000 faculty positions was permanently deleted from the budget. Present collective bargaining agreements (Article 20.7, Unit 3) specify faculty workload and compensation for regular faculty for substitute purposes depending on the duration of the assignment. Adequate funding is necessary to fairly compensate faculty substitutes as well as to provide quality education to students when regularly scheduled faculty are unable to meet the classes.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairs, Campus Senates
FROM: Bernard Goldstein, Chair
Academic Senate CSU

DATE: February 11, 1987

Based upon the meeting with the Campus Senate Chairs on Tuesday, February 10th, the following revision of the paragraph on support for scholarship is proposed:

Recall that the current language in the Master Plan for the CSU is as follows:

"The California State University and Colleges shall have as its primary function the provision of undergraduate instruction and graduate instruction through the master's degree."

The Master Plan also states that:

"Faculty research is authorized to the extent that it is consistent with the primary function of the California State University and Colleges."

The proposed revision —

"The primary function of the CSU is the provision of instruction for undergraduate students, and for graduate students through authorized and supported advanced degrees. Faculty scholarship, research and creative activity which enhance instruction, or are related to areas of public interest, are authorized and supported."

Upon further reflection and discussion with several other Academic Senators, the following sentence is an alternative to the last sentence in the above quoted proposed revision:

"Faculty scholarship, research, and creative activity are integral to the instructional and public service functions of the CSU."

Please respond to the proposed revision as indicated in this memorandum (February 11th) and disregard the statement in the memorandum of February 9th no later than April 1st.

BG/he