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ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

RESOLUTION ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Background Information: Cal Poly does not have a faculty code of ethics. It is generally recognized throughout the academic profession that, for a variety of reasons such a code is desirable. Furthermore, President Baker has requested that the Academic Senate consider the formulation of such a code for Cal Poly. In reviewing other established codes, the Personnel Policies Committee believes that the Code of the American Association of University Professors covers in general all of the pertinent concepts, and, accordingly, recommends that this code be adopted at Cal Poly.

WHEREAS, Members of the academic profession have unique responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, It is recognized that a statement of our professional ethics will support existing standards and practices of faculty with respect to integrity and ethics; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the following be accepted as a code of ethics for Cal Poly faculty and that it be placed in the Faculty Handbook:
STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

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

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

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

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

V. As a member of his community, the professor has the right and obligations of any citizen. He measures the urgency of these obligations in the light of his responsibilities to his subject, to his students, to his profession, and to his institution. When he speaks or acts as a private person he avoids creating the impression that he speaks or acts for his college or university. As a citizen engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, the professor has a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.
RESOLUTION ON PROGRESS POINTS AND +/- GRADING

BACKGROUND: In its last session the Academic Senate passed a resolution adopting, as an option, the further refinement to grading afforded by the use of the +/- system. An apparent difficulty arises when we attempt to incorporate this change with the use of progress points. Progress points affords us a means of tracking students who do not pass courses undertaken on a CR/NC basis and are inconspicuously deficient grade points because CR/NC is not reflected in GPA. A student must maintain a GPA above 2.0 and twice as many progress points as courses taken. Given our new system, it is possible for a student to fall below the 2.0 GPA by obtaining a C- (valued at 1.7) without a compensating C+ or higher grade. On the other hand, a student taking the course CR/NC and also receiving a C- would not be embarrassed by the Administration because a C- counts as a CR and that gives him two progress points which sustains him at the minimum on the other system. The faculty has no way of rectifying this because as things now stand, all that is allowed is a grade notation to be converted, under certain circumstances, into a CR/NC by an anonymous entity in the Records Office. A scandalous state of affairs to be sure! In attempting to refine the system we have compromised its integrity. The injustice; however, is not as alarming as it at first appears. Only students with a 2.0 GPA or better are allowed to take certain courses outside their major for CR/NC. The only other case where students are allowed to take classes for CR/NC are specific requirements (such as internships) offered within their major where, presumably, they are being closely monitored by their department. The intent of the CR/NC system is meritorious and should not be placed in jeopardy by an equally worthy attempt to indicate more accurately a student's accomplishment which is the intent of the +/- system.

WHEREAS, there may infrequently arise irreconcilable difficulties occasioned by the simultaneous use of +/- grading and progress points; and

WHEREAS, the advantages derived from the two systems far outweigh the occasional dilemma which stems from their separate logics; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That when a C- or higher grade is assigned to a student who has petitioned for CR/NC grading, the Records Office shall assign the grade of CR and award two progress points.
RESOLUTION ON SABBATICAL LEAVES

Background: In March 1982 Vice President Jones sent to the Chair of the Academic Senate a request for review of the University's sabbatical leave policies, procedures, and guidelines (CAM 385-386). More specifically, the guidelines and procedures, CAM 386.5.C were cited by Vice President Jones as favoring faculty applications based on seniority and the number of previous unsuccessful applications. Further, CAM 386.5.D was criticized as follows: The current quota system of distributing leaves to Schools sometimes results in the funding of a mediocre or poor proposal while a high quality proposal in another School goes unfunded.

The Personnel Policies Committee reviewed CAM 385 and 386 and decided that only the guidelines and procedures need be revised in order to stress the quality of the proposal rather than seniority, etc. The Committee thought that the present School quota system of distribution was consistent with overall University policies pertaining to allocations of this nature. (CAM Sections 386.5.C and 386.5.D are attached).

WHEREAS, Sabbatical leave money has become severely limited, and the old criteria are based on adequate funding; and

WHEREAS, These proposed changes are core consistent with what is actually occurring; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the CAM Section 386.5.C be changed as follows:

C. Guidelines and Procedures

Each school shall elect a sabbatical leave guideline and procedures committee composed of teaching faculty, who in consultation with the School Dean shall prepare guidelines that shall be concerned with but not limited to:

1. Purpose: The purpose of leave is for research, study, or travel or any combination of these.

2. Benefits to University: Consideration shall be given to leaves particularly beneficial to the University, school/division, or department.
3. Guidelines and Procedures: These should include the method of establishing the school sabbatical leave screening committee and the rules and/or procedures pertaining to the evaluation process.

Guidelines as outlined above shall be submitted to the faculty of the school and Academic Vice President for approval. The sabbatical leave screening committee will interview all leave applicants of that school as soon as practical, after the application deadline, and evaluate the applications based upon merits of their proposals and the school guidelines.
C. Guidelines and Procedures

Each school shall elect a sabbatical leave guidelines and procedures committee composed of teaching faculty, who in consultation with the school dean shall prepare guidelines that shall be concerned with, but not limited to, items below.

1. The relative weight to be assigned to the following categories of sabbatical leave applications when:
   a. Their purpose of leave is for (1) study, (2) research, (3) travel, or any combination of these
   b. The applications are from faculty members who have had a previous sabbatical leave as compared to those applying for their first leave.

2. The priority to be given to the following factors:
   a. The length of service in the university of the applicant
   b. The recency of other leaves, such as fellowships and grants through nonstate funding or other leaves with pay
   c. The recency of previous unsuccessful applications
   d. A purpose which is more innovative than traditional
   e. A leave more beneficial to the university at large than to school/department
   f. The length of service remaining prior to retirement.

3. Guidelines and procedures shall include the method of establishing sabbatical leave screening committee subject to the constraint that all replacements for the sabbatical leave screening committee be selected in the same manner as the original screening committee.

Guidelines as outlined above shall be submitted to the faculty of the school for approval. The sabbatical leave screening committee will interview all leave applicants of that school as soon as practicable after the application deadline, and evaluate the applications based upon merits of their proposals and the school guidelines.

D. Distribution of Sabbatical Leave Positions within the University

The number of sabbatical leaves allocated to the university will be distributed on an equitable basis among the schools. Guidelines for distributing sabbatical leaves include an initial distribution of one sabbatical leave to each school, with the balance of the allocation to be distributed according to the ratio of eligible faculty members in the respective schools to the total eligible faculty in the university. Not later than October 15, the Director of Personnel Relations will determine, in consultation with the Director of Business Affairs, the projected number of sabbatical leaves for the following year which would be allocated to the respective schools under the guidelines and will report the projection to the school deans, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Chairperson of the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate. The Director of Personnel Relations shall also publicize the projection in the Cal Poly Report and through the Academic Senate.

The school deans shall then provide those eligible members of their schools with the projection figures and copies of the procedures and guidelines utilized in establishing priority lists of candidates and alternates. In the event sufficient applications are not received by any school, the Personnel Review Committee will recommend a redistribution of the unfilled leaves to the other schools after considering an equitable distribution in accordance with CAM 386.5.E.3. If unfilled sabbatical leave slots are still available, the committee will recommend candidate(s) after considering the guidelines of the schools and the applications of the highest alternates on the priority lists submitted by the schools.