I. Minutes:
   Approval of the January 26, 1988 Minutes (pp. 4-6).

II. Communications:
   A. Materials available for reading in the Academic Senate office (pp. 2-3).
   B. Letter from Geigle to Chairs dated 1/22/88 re Recruitment for Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs (p. 7).
   C. Letter from McCarty to Child Care Designees dated 1/22/88 re Employee Child Care Survey (pp. 8-9).

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

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:
   A. Resolution on Academic Promotion-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, Second Reading (pp. 10-16).
   B. Tenure for Academic Employees-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, Second Reading (pp. 17-22).
   C. Resolution on Extra Sabbatical Positions for Spring 1988-Executive Committee, First Reading (pp. 23-24).
   D. Resolution on Indirect Costs Utilization: CAM 543-Jamieson, Chair of the Research Committee, First Reading (pp. 25-30).
   E. GE&B Course Proposal for PSY 494-Lewis, Chair of the GE&B Committee, First Reading (pp. 31-33).
   F. Resolution on Department Name Change: Speech Communication to Communication-Sharp, First Reading (pp. 34-39).
   G. Resolution on Department Name Change: Foreign Languages Department to Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, Little, First Reading (pp. 40-42).

VI. Discussion Items:

VII. Adjournment:
Materials Available for Reading in the Academic Senate Office (FOB 25H)

(New reading materials highlighted in bold)

1987-88 AY
Minutes from the bimonthly meetings of the Multiple-Criteria Admissions Program Technical Study Group (Cal Poly, SLO)

June 1987
Documents/statistics/reports/etc. provided at the Student Retention Conference in June 1987

6/10/87
Correspondence from Eric Seastrand re allocation of lottery funds to the CSU and Board of Trustees' Committee on Finance Report on the Lottery Revenue Budget Process

6/22/87
Publications from the Office of the Chancellor re Teacher Education

7/14/87
CSU Committee of the Whole: New Priority Topics for 1987-88

7/28/87
Status Report #4-FY 1987/88, CSU Final Budget Quarterly Internal Report on Enrollment-Summer 1987 (Cal Poly, SLO)

July 1987
The Master Plan Renewed, Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education

8/3/87
Quarterly Internal Report on Enrollment-Summer 1987 (Cal Poly, SLO)

Aug 1987
Subject Matter Assessment of Prospective English Teachers (CSU)

9/4/87
Capital Outlay Program 1988-89

9/15/87
Board of Trustees' Agenda, September 15/16, 1987

9/23/87
1986/87 Discretionary Fund Reports (Cal Poly, SLO)

10/12/87
Executive Review Policies and Procedures

10/20/87
Funding Excellence in Higher Education (CPEC)
The State's Interest in Student Outcomes Assessment (CPEC)
State Incentive Funding Approaches for Promoting Quality in California Higher Education: A Prospectus (CPEC)
Assembly Bill #2016 - Higher Education Talent Development

October 1987
CPSU FOUNDATION Annual Report 1986-1987

10/28/87
State Incentive Funding Approaches (memo from Kerschner to VPAA's dated 10/28/87)

10/30/87
Organizational charts of administrative positions throughout the CSU system (CSU)

11/2/87
Academic Mainframe Computer Replacement Plan (CSU)

11/5/87
Earthquake Status Report (CSU, Los Angeles)

11/6/87
Quarterly Internal Report on Enrollment-Fall 1987 (Cal Poly, SLO)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/12/87</td>
<td>Retreat Rights for Academic Administrators (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/87</td>
<td>Summary Notes of the President's Council Meetings (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/87</td>
<td>Status of Current Major Capital Outlay Projects (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1987</td>
<td>Computer-Aided Productivity Center (Cal Poly SLO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1987</td>
<td>Development Activities of the University Relations Division (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1987</td>
<td>Recommendations of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1987</td>
<td>Cal Poly IBM Specialty Center (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/87</td>
<td>Internationalizing Undergraduate Education Conference Highlights (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/87</td>
<td>Asilomar Retreat of the Academic Senate CSU (Nov 13-15, 1987). Summary of the Executive Committee and campus Senate chairs' meetings (Academic Senate CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/87</td>
<td>Allocation of MPPP Awards 1987-88 (number of awards to each school) (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/87</td>
<td>Summer Bridge and Intensive Learning Experience: Second Year Evaluation (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/88</td>
<td>CSU Systemwide Full-Time Faculty by Tenure Status, Sex and Ethnicity: 1975-1987 (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan '88</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA DEMOGRAPHICS: IMPACT ON EDUCATION - CAL POLY. HAROLD HODGKINSON, A LECTURE IN CHUMASH AUDITORIUM (Video Cassette)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALIFORNIA: THE STATE AND ITS EDUCATION SYSTEM by Harold L. Hodgkinson (booklet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/14/88</td>
<td>Enrollment by Ethnic Categories in the California State Colleges (Cal Poly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/6/88</td>
<td>Report of the Technical Study Group on the Multiple-Criteria Applicant Selection Process (Cal Poly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/14/88</td>
<td>Statistical Abstract to July 1986 (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20/88</td>
<td>CSU IBM Academic Mainframe Speciality Center (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 22, 1988

TO: Chairs, Campus Academic Senates

FROM: Ray Geigle, Chair
       Academic Senate CSU

SUBJECT: Recruitment for Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Recruitment is under way for a new Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This is an especially important position to the faculty as the successful applicant will assume responsibility for system coordination of most of our academic programs. We are searching for applicants who have had a long, distinguished record of teaching in the CSU and some substantial administrative experience at the level of Dean or Associate Vice President.

The announced deadline for applications was February 1. However, because so many faculty have been on semester break, the deadline has been extended to March 1, 1988. I have enclosed a copy of the position announcement. Will you kindly call this position vacancy to the attention of your faculty and make nominations of persons you believe are qualified to fill this position.

Thank you for your help.

RG/he

Enclosure
To: Campus Child Care Designees  
Academic Senate

From: Mac L. McCarty, Director  
State University Benefits Programs  
Faculty and Staff Relations

Subject: Employee Child Care Survey

In the next few days the child care consultants will mail the child care survey forms to the homes of a random stratified sample of employees. The employee sample includes both full-time and part-time employees (including part-time Lecturers).

It has been the experience of the consultant that employer-sponsored publicity will increase the response rate. Since a high response rate is important to the success of this survey we request your assistance in publicizing the importance of a response by all employees selected to participate.

Attached is a sample notice to employees which may be revised as appropriate for your campus. The notice should be communicated to all employees of your campus by the most expeditious means.

Thanks for your help. If you have any questions please call me at (213) 590-5587 or ATSS 635-5587.

MLM/sh

Attachment

cc: Presidents  
Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations  
Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs  
Vice Presidents/Deans of Students  
Vice Presidents, Administration  
Vice Presidents, Business Affairs  
Associate Vice Presidents/Deans, Faculty Affairs  
Chairs, Faculty Senates  
Directors, Children's Centers  
Personnel Officers  
Chancellor's Office Staff
Sample letter to all CSU employees

Child Care Needs Assessment

I am pleased to announce that the CSU is conducting an extensive evaluation of the child care needs of employees. (A similar study is underway to assess the child care needs of students.) As a first step, a survey is being mailed to the homes of selected CSU employees. The survey sample was selected so that it is statistically representative of all employees. It is important for each surveyed employee to respond -- both parents and non-parents.

The survey is designed to determine the scope of the child care needs of CSU employees. The consultants will analyze the responses to determine what types of difficulties employees have with child care and how this impacts the work environment.

If you have been selected to participate in the survey, your response can be very valuable and I encourage you to participate. All questionnaires will be treated confidentially by the consultants and only summary data will be reported.

Your cooperation and participation will be greatly appreciated.
Background statement: The current sections of CAM (342.2 and 344) covering academic promotion and tenure have been out-of-date since 1983—the date of the initial collective bargaining contract. In addition, two other concerns were brought to the attention of the Personnel Policies Committee in recent months:

1. Early promotion and tenure cases are not adequately addressed in the current CAM sections;
2. Academic promotion of administrators is not addressed in CAM.

These CAM sections were considered simultaneously by the committee in order to formulate a coherent policy. The committee recommends the following resolutions be approved concurrently by the Academic Senate.

AS-——88/——

RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC PROMOTION

WHEREAS, The current CAM 342.2 is out-of-date; and
WHEREAS, Early promotion is not adequately addressed in the current CAM 342.2; and
WHEREAS, Academic promotion of administrators is not addressed in CAM; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the current CAM 342.2 be deleted; and be it further
RESOLVED: That the attached CAM 342.2 be added.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
January 19, 1988
342.2 ACADEMIC PROMOTIONS

A. Eligibility

Promotion eligibility shall be governed by the terms of Article 14 of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the CSU and Unit 3 Faculty. In particular, tenure is required for promotion to professor. In addition, persons (other than department heads/chairs) whose primary duties are administrative shall not be eligible for academic promotion.

B. Criteria and Procedures (also consult CAM 341.1.D, E and F)

1. Performance reviews for promotion purposes shall be conducted in accordance with Article 15 of the MOU. Additional school (department) criteria and procedures shall be in accordance with the MOU and shall be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

2. Applicants for promotion shall submit a resume which indicates evidence of promotability. This resume shall include all categories pertinent to promotion consideration: teaching activities 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, university, or community.

To assist applicants in preparing their resumes, the dean of each school shall forward a copy of the Faculty Resume Worksheet (CAM Appendix XII) to each applicant at the beginning of the promotion cycle.

3. In addition to their carefully documented recommendations, department peer review committees, department heads/chairs, school peer review committees, and school deans shall submit a ranking of those promotion applicants who were positively recommended at their respective level.

4. Promotion in rank is in no way automatic and is granted only in recognition of competence, professional performance, and meritorious service during the period in rank. Recommendations for promotion of individuals are based on the exhibition of merit and ability in each of the following four factors:

a. Teaching Performance and/or Other Professional Performance

Consideration is to be given to such factors as the faculty member's competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of course, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student consultation, and other factors relating to performance as a teacher. The evaluation in formulating recommendations on the promotion of teaching faculty, evaluators will place emphasis on success in instruction. The results of the Student Evaluation of Faculty
program are to be considered in formulating recommendations based on teaching performance.

b. Professional Growth and Achievement
Consideration is to be given to the faculty member's original preparation and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies, and publications.

c. Service to University and Community
Consideration is to be given to the faculty member's participation in academic advisement; placement follow-up; cocurricular activities; department, school, and university committees and individual assignments; systemwide assignments; and service in community affairs directly related to the faculty member's teaching service area, as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

d. Other Factors of Consideration
Consideration is to be given to such factors as the faculty member's ability to relate with colleagues, initiative, cooperativeness, and dependability.

5. Department heads/chairs and deans shall use Form 109 (CAM Appendix I) for evaluation of promotion applicants. Department (school) peer review committees will submit their recommendations in a form that is in accordance with their department (school) promotion procedures.

6. Normal Promotion

a. An application for promotion to associate professor is considered normal if the applicant is eligible and both of the following conditions hold:

(i) the applicant is tenured or the applicant is also applying for tenure.

(ii) the applicant has received four Merit Salary Adjustments (MSA's) (while an assistant professor) or the applicant has reached the maximum salary for assistant professor.

b. An application for promotion to professor is considered normal if the applicant is eligible and the applicant has received four MSA's (while an associate professor) or the applicant has reached the maximum salary for associate professor.

7. Early Promotion

a. An application for promotion to associate professor is considered "early" if the applicant is eligible and one (or both) of the following is (are) true:
(i) the applicant is a probationary faculty member who is not also applying for tenure.

(ii) the applicant has not received four MSA's (while an assistant professor) and the applicant has not reached the maximum salary for assistant professor.

b. An application for promotion to professor is considered "early" if the applicant is eligible and the applicant has not received four MSA's (while an associate professor) and the applicant has not reached the maximum salary for associate professor.

c. Early promotion will only be granted in exceptional cases. The circumstances which make the case exceptional shall be fully documented by the candidate and validated by evaluators. The fact that an applicant meets the criteria for normal promotion does not in itself constitute an exceptional case. The fact that an applicant for early promotion meets the minimum performance criteria for promotion does not in itself constitute an exceptional case.
A. Eligibility

1. Persons occupying academic rank positions but assigned full time to non-instructional 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 rank solely by virtue of added administrative responsibility. Merit salary increases are increases within a salary range and are not considered to be promotions. Exception to this promotion policy may be authorized only by the University President or a designee.

3. An academic employee must have tenure or be simultaneously awarded tenure before promotion to the Associate Professor or Professor ranks can be approved. The granting of tenure does not guarantee future promotion.

4. Possession of the doctorate or other normal terminal degree from an accredited institution is a usual prerequisite for promotion beyond the rank of Assistant Professor. Exceptions may be made in those instances where the faculty member has received recognition for outstanding professional accomplishment in the academic community and possesses special qualifications according to approved criteria established for personnel actions by each department, school, or other organizational unit.

5. The Dean of each School shall notify all faculty who are eligible for promotion consideration by the last day of instruction in September of the academic year in which they are eligible, or as soon thereafter as possible. Only those technically eligible faculty members who submit a written request to the School Dean for promotion consideration by a date specified by the School's statement of personnel action procedures shall be evaluated for promotion.

To assist each faculty member in preparing his/her resume, the Dean of each School shall forward a copy of the policy statement requiring an updated resume (CAM 342.2.A.6) and a copy of the Faculty Resume Worksheet appearing in CAM Appendix XII at the time of notification of eligibility for promotion consideration.

6. Each faculty member requesting promotion consideration shall update his/her personnel file and submit a resume which indicates evidence of promotability. This resume shall include all categories pertinent to promotion consideration: teaching activities and performance, professional growth and achievement, service to the university and community, and any other activities or interests which indicate professional commitment, service, or contribution to the discipline, department, university, or community.

7. In exceptional cases, a faculty member who is not technically eligible (by virtue of not having served one full academic year at the fifth step of the then held rank) is recognized both on and off campus (i.e., by state or national professional societies) as outstanding in all areas of evaluation according to approved criteria established by each department, school or other professional unit, may be considered for promotion. In such instances, a department's faculty and department head may initiate a request for early promotion review and make a recommendation to the Dean that will then become a part of the regular promotion cycle in that academic year.

8. The number of promotions within the university shall not exceed existing budget appropriations available for such promotions.

B. Criteria and Procedures for Promotion in Rank

Promotion in rank is in no way automatic but is granted only in recognition of competence, professional performance, and meritorious service during the period in rank. Recommendations for promotion of individuals are based on the four factors and their subordinate subfactors listed on the Faculty Evaluation Form with emphasis on the exhibition of merit and ability in each factor. The criterion for each is relevance to the faculty member's overall contribution to the total objectives of the university, the basic purpose of which is to serve the students. Moreover, because there is a wide range of talents in the faculty, a variety of...
(4) Does not meet satisfactorily the requirements of the present assignment.

b. The department head will write the reasons for the rating of each member, using the positive approach of specific examples of achievement relative to any appropriate items. In support of the evaluation, the department head shall provide reliable evidence which will validate the rating and the recommendation.

c. The department head will place emphasis on success in instruction.

d. Since professional improvement, as well as promotion, is a goal of this evaluation program, the department head will discuss with each member the content of the report made on the individual. The evaluation report on each academic employee shall be initialed by the individual before it is submitted to the school dean or division head.

e. The department head will present to and discuss with the school dean or division head the written recommendations for promotions by February 10. In arriving at recommendations the department head will consult tenured members of the department staff, or a committee of same, having ranks higher than those of the persons eligible, and the results of such consultation shall be presented in writing to accompany the recommendations. The consultative evaluation, signed by the committee chairperson or the committee members, or as 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.

f. Priority lists by department and school/division should be submitted with the promotion evaluations of those being recommended for promotion. The criteria to be used for ranking at the department and school levels are the same as that used in determining whether or not promotion is recommended. The departmental priority listing should originate with the appropriate departmental faculty committee, reviewed at each consultative level and included as part of the total promotion package. Deans, in arriving at a single priority list for the school, are to consult with a standing or ad hoc committee comprised of either the Chair of the Tenured Faculty (provided this person is a tenured full Professor) or a tenured full Professor selected from each department. If a department does not have a tenured full professor, there will not be membership on the committee from that department unless otherwise provided for in the approved school procedures or approved in advance by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Reports, evaluations, and recommendations of all candidates for promotion regardless of whether promotion is recommended at the departmental level, together with the departmental priority list, should be made available to members of the school standing or ad hoc committee. This committee may request additional information concerning faculty members being considered for promotion. The report by the committee to the school deans should include a recommendation for each individual who has requested promotion as to: (1) whether or not promotion is recommended; and (2) a relative ranking of those being recommended for promotion. Recommendations by the committee are advisory to the school dean/division head who is required to submit a recommendation for each candidate and a single priority list of those recommended for promotion at school level.
g. If an individual is not recommended for promotion by the department head, the person shall be invited by the department head, in writing, to discuss the decision; if the individual is not recommended for promotion by the school dean or division head but is recommended by the department head, the school dean or division head shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision in the presence of the department head. When discussions are held they shall take place prior to submission of materials to the Personnel Review Committee by March 15. When the school dean or division head disagrees with the department head's recommendation, a copy of the evaluation shall be sent to the faculty member.

h. The school dean or division head will evaluate the performance of the department heads in the school or division, taking into consideration performance of administrative duties, and will make recommendations on department heads.

i. School deans, division heads or directors will present recommendations to the appropriate Vice President or the Dean of Students by March 10.

j. Review of recommendations will be forwarded by the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate on May 1 to the President's designee (Vice President for Academic Affairs, Executive Vice President or Dean of Students, as appropriate).

k. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, Executive Vice President, and Dean of Students will forward their recommendation to the President.

l. Notices to faculty of promotion or nonpromotion are sent by the University President by June 1.

C. Effective Date of Promotions

The effective date for faculty promotions will be stated in the notice sent by the University President to the promoted faculty members. In accordance with existing regulations, effective dates for pay purposes of promotions in rank are determined as follows:

1. Academic Year and 10-Month Employees

Promotions of academic year and 10-month employees who will have completed at least one full year of service at the fifth step of an academic rank by the beginning of the fall quarter of the college year following receipt of notice of promotion are effective with the beginning of the September pay period.

Promotions of academic year and 10-month employees who will have completed one full year of service at the fifth step of an academic rank at a date during the next college year but after the beginning of the fall quarter will become effective with the beginning of the first academic quarter following completion of one year of service in the fifth pay step.

2. 12-Month Academic Employees

Promotions of 12-month academic employees who, at the time of notification of promotion, have not yet completed at least one full year of service at the fifth step of an academic rank will become effective with the beginning of the month following completion of one year of service in the fifth pay step but no earlier than the beginning of the next September pay period.

Promotions of 12-month academic employees who at the time of notification of promotion have already completed at least one full year of service at the fifth pay step of an academic rank will become effective with the beginning of the next September pay period.

Revised December, 1982
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Background statement: The current sections of CAM (342.2 and 344) covering academic promotion and tenure have been out-of-date since 1983—the date of the initial collective bargaining contract. In addition, two other concerns were brought to the attention of the Personnel Policies Committee in recent months:

1. Early promotion and tenure cases are not adequately addressed in the current CAM sections;
2. Academic promotion of administrators is not addressed in CAM.

These CAM sections were considered simultaneously by the committee in order to formulate a coherent policy. The committee recommends the following resolutions be approved concurrently by the Academic Senate.

AS—-88/___

RESOLUTION ON TENURE FOR ACADEMIC EMPLOYEES

WHEREAS, The current CAM 344 is out-of-date; and
WHEREAS, Early tenure is not adequately addressed in the current CAM 344; and
RESOLVED: That the current CAM 344 be deleted; and be it further
RESOLVED: That the attached CAM 344 be added.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
January 19, 1988
TENURE FOR ACADEMIC EMPLOYEES

A. Eligibility

Tenure eligibility shall be governed by the terms of Article 13 of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the CSU and Unit 3 Faculty.

B. Criteria and Procedures (also consult CAM 341.1.D, E and F)

1. Tenure decisions are considered more critical to the university than promotion decisions. The fact that a probationary faculty member has received early promotion to associate professor is not a guarantee of tenure.

2. Performance reviews for the purpose of award of tenure shall be conducted in accordance with Article 15 of the MOU. Additional school (department) criteria and procedures shall be in accordance with the MOU and shall be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

3. Applicants for tenure shall submit a resume which indicates evidence supporting the award of tenure. This resume shall include all categories pertinent to tenure consideration, teaching activities 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, university, or community.

To assist applicants in preparing their resumes, the dean of each school shall forward a copy of the Faculty Resume Worksheet (CAM Appendix XII) to each applicant at the beginning of the tenure cycle.

4. Recommendations for tenure are based on the same factors as for promotion (see CAM 342.2.B.4). In addition, special attention shall be given to the applicant's working relationships with colleagues, potential for further professional achievement, and commitment to the department and university. The award of tenure is a major commitment by the university to the applicant and recommendations should substantiate the fact that such an award is advantageous to the university.

5. Department heads/chairs and deans shall use Form 109 (CAM Appendix I) for evaluation of tenure applicants. Department (school) peer review committees shall submit their recommendations in a form that is in accordance with department (school) tenure procedures.

6. Normal Tenure

A tenure award is considered normal if the award is made after the applicant has credit for six (6) years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment, MOU 13.3, 13.4).
7. Early Tenure

a. A tenure award is considered "early" if the award is made prior to the applicant's having credit for six (6) years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

b. In addition to meeting department (school) criteria for normal tenure, an applicant for early tenure must provide evidence of outstanding performance in each of the areas of teaching, professional growth and achievement, and service to the university and community.

c. Tenure awarded by the President at the time of appointment (MOU 13.16) shall be considered as early tenure, and such an award shall be made in accordance with the paragraph above. (CAM 344.1.B.7.b). Candidates for appointment with tenure shall normally be tenured professors at other universities--exceptions to this provision must be carefully documented.

d. In order to receive early tenure, an applicant shall, at a minimum, receive a favorable majority vote from the department peer review committee.
D. Recommendations will be based on job performance, personal relationships, professional ethics, and acceptance and implementation of respective department, school and campuswide objectives. (See Support Staff Employee Performance Evaluation Form, Appendix II.)

344 Permanent Status (Tenure)

344.1 Eligibility

A. A full-time academic employee may be considered for tenure at any time during the probationary period as outlined below.

1. The normal pattern of awarding tenure shall involve the assessment of a faculty member's performance over a period of four successive academic years; for those denied tenure following the fourth probationary year, a fifth year as a terminal notice year shall be awarded.

2. The University President may determine to award a fifth probationary year appointment. Should it be considered by the end of that year that more time is still necessary to evaluate the probationary academic employee for tenure purposes, the President may award a final sixth probationary year appointment. For those denied tenure following the fifth or sixth probationary year, a terminal notice year shall be awarded. A probationary academic employee shall not serve more than seven successive full-time years.

3. The University President in special circumstances may award tenure to any probationary academic employee earlier than the normal probationary period when, following an evaluation of the performance of the faculty member at the university, it is found that such early awarding of tenure is advantageous to the institution. Evaluation and recommendation for early tenure under this provision is to be conducted and submitted for consideration only during the candidate's scheduled evaluation cycle for reappointment. (See Appendix V for Schedule of Deadlines.)

4. If an academic employee is initially appointed to the rank of Professor (Principal Instructor or Principal Vocational Instructor), the employee may be considered for tenure during the first year of employment and shall be considered for tenure during the second year of employment. The employee shall be notified not later than December 15 of the second academic year that one of the following actions will be taken: (1) employment will be terminated at the end of the second academic year; (2) tenure will be granted; or (3) the employee is to receive further evaluation and notice by June 1 of that academic year as to whether the employee will be granted tenure or will be granted a terminal notice year.

5. Notification of award or denial of tenure is made in accordance with 5 Cal. Adm. Code 43566 as follows:

a. Notification of all decisions regarding the award or denial of tenure to academic employees shall be in writing and signed by the University President.

b. The notice of intention not to award tenure to an 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.

Revised December, 1976
c. The awarding of tenure may be accomplished only by notice by the President. Notwithstanding any provision of the Campus Administrative Manual to the contrary, no person shall be deemed to have been awarded tenure 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.

B. Administrative Employees

Administrative employees will be considered for permanent appointment at the time of their third performance evaluation. (See CAM 344.3.)

After serving full time successfully and acceptably for two successive years, and administrative employee becomes a permanent employee on beginning the third year of service subject to reassignment in accordance with Sections 66609 and 89539 of the Education Code.

C. Support Staff Employees

Support staff employees will be considered for permanent appointment at the time of their third performance evaluation. (See CAM 343.3.)

After serving full time successfully and acceptably for one year, a support staff employee becomes a permanent employee on beginning the second year of service.

D. Successive years of service means continuous service unbroken by the separation and subsequent re-employment of the employee. However, under certain circumstances the school dean may determine that a leave without pay for one year or less for an academic employee may count toward the required service for tenure. (See CAM 387.2.F.) As provided in CAM 344.4.B, up to two years of full-time lectureships may be approved by the school dean as probationary service toward tenure.

344.2 Procedure for According Tenure to Academic Employees (5 Cal. Adm. Code 43560)

A. Each year by October 1 the Director of Personnel Relations will send lists of all academic personnel eligible to be considered for tenure to department heads, the university library director, deans, and vice presidents. (See CAM 344.1)

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 tenure or nontenure 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 341.1 and will submit by November 1 the names of recommended and non-recommended personnel. (For first year academic employees being considered for tenure, January 17 is the date for this purpose.) In arriving at a recommendation, the department head will consult tenured members of the department faculty and the results of such consultation must be presented in writing to accompany the recommendation. The consultative evaluation signed by the committee chairperson or the committee members, or as 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. 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.)

D. To be recommended for tenure the employee must be rated during the final probationary year within one of the top two performance categories listed in Section V of the Faculty Evaluation Form. If the department head recommends nontenure, a written invitation shall be sent to the individual to discuss the decision; if an initial recommendation of nontenure is made by the school dean, the individual shall be invited, in writing, to discuss the decision with the dean in the presence of the department head.

E. School deans, division heads or directors will submit their evaluations and recommendations to the appropriate Vice President or Dean of Students by November 15 for second year personnel; December 5 for personnel with three or more years of probationary service; and January 31 for first year academic employees.

F. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will submit to the chairperson of the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate by November 19 or December 10 respectively, a list of all nonrecommended personnel for review by the Committee. (February 9 is the date to be used for this purpose for first year faculty who are being considered for tenure.) At the request of the Chairperson of the Personnel Review Committee, a sampling of positive recommendations will be provided. In addition, a list of those individuals who have been recommended for extended probationary periods (with the exception of those where there is no disagreement between recommending levels) will be submitted to the Personnel Review Committee Chairperson.

G. The Chairperson of the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate will report the results of its review and recommendations to the appropriate Vice President or Dean of Students by December 1 for second year personnel; January 15 for personnel with three or more years of probationary service; February 15 for first year academic employees. The Chairperson will forward to each school dean a copy of that portion of the report pertaining to personnel within their appropriate school.

H. The appropriate Vice President or Dean of Students will forward his/her recommendations to the University President.

I. The University President will notify all academic employees:

1. Who are reappointed for the following year with tenure
2. Who are not granted tenure and whose reappointment for the following year constitutes another probationary year appointment
3. Who are not granted tenure and whose reappointment for the following year constitutes a terminal notice year appointment
4. Who are not granted tenure and whose employment is to be terminated at the close of the current year

J. Twelve-month academic employees are subject to the same tenure provisions and notice dates as academic year employees.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS—88/____

RESOLUTION ON
EXTRA SABBATICAL POSITIONS FOR SPRING 1988

WHEREAS, There are three (3) sabbatical leave positions remaining for the 1987/88 academic year; and

WHEREAS, Any unused sabbatical leave money will have to be returned to the state; and

WHEREAS, Returning unused sabbatical leave money may undermine future efforts to acquire additional sabbatical leave funding from the system; and

WHEREAS, No unfunded sabbatical leave requests remain from 1987/88 to select from; and

WHEREAS, There is insufficient time to use the normal University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC) sabbatical leave review process; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the attached review process be approved for the review and allocation of the three (3) remaining sabbatical leave positions for the 1987/88 academic year.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Executive Committee
February 2, 1988
Memorandum

To: All Faculty Eligible for a Sabbatical Leave

Date: January 25, 1988

File No.: 

Copies:

From: Paul T. Adalian, Jr., Chair
University Professional Leave Committee

Subject: Extra Sabbatical Positions for Spring 1988

The University Professional Leave Committee was notified in the middle of December that there were three one quarter sabbatical leave positions still available for use during the 1987-88 Fiscal Year. This issue was discussed at our first meeting of 1988.

The UPLC is requesting applications for these three one quarter sabbaticals for this Spring. The UPLC has also contacted all applicants of one quarter sabbaticals for next year to determine if any wish to move their leave up to this Spring Quarter.

Since there will be no school allotments, and to expedite the processing of applications, the UPLC recommends that the school committees be by-passed in this unusual case. Applications will be reviewed by the Department Head, Dean, and the UPLC.

Please contact me at Extension 2649 if you are interested in applying. The UPLC needs to know how many applications there will be so it can plan its work schedule.

NOTE: All applicants last year were awarded sabbaticals as a result of extra funding. If there were applicants who did not receive a sabbatical the UPLC would have contacted these faculty members first. The UPLC inquired if these extra funds could be rolled over into next year's sabbatical funding. Unfortunately, the funds must be used this year.

Deadline Dates

Applications submitted to Department Head. February 2nd

Department Head reviews and forwards to School Dean. February 5th

School Dean reviews and forwards to UPLC. February 9th

UPLC reviews and forwards to Academic Vice-President. February 14th
Background Statement:

Three and a half years ago a modification to the formula for distributing overhead earned on sponsored projects was put in place which froze administrative costs to encourage research activity. The plan was to return more funds to schools, departments, and faculty. In the past few years, there has been an increase in proposal activity and sponsored grants. The number of proposals sent off campus has almost doubled, and Cal Poly's grants have increased from $2.2 million in AY 1985 to over $4.4 million in AY 1987.

It is difficult to ascribe this increase to any single cause. A good many other changes were made during that period which were directed to improving grant activity. However, it is understood that an important element in continuing grant activity on campus is the seeding of related work through development activity and small grants. The proposed revision to CAM 543 will support both those ends.

RESOLUTION ON INDIRECT COSTS UTILIZATION: CAM 543

WHEREAS, An experiment in the distribution of indirect costs earned on sponsored projects was implemented beginning with AY 1985; and

WHEREAS, It has been tested for a three-year period; and

WHEREAS, It is a complicated procedure; and

WHEREAS, It is desirable to simplify the procedure and maintain the value of the original plan; and

WHEREAS, Administrative changes have also occurred which should be reflected in CAM 543; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the attached changes to CAM 543 be endorsed and forwarded by the Academic Senate to the President for consideration.

Proposed by: Research Committee
On: November 18, 1987
PROPOSED CAM REVISION

543 Indirect Costs--Definition

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 Research 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 office 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 Director of Research Development Associate Vice President for 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 direct 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

3. Other, including space reimbursement, professional association dues for the Foundation, fees for partial support of the University Services and the GSU University Services Program, and so on.

C. The Director of Research Development 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 University Academic Senate Research Committee. Its objective shall be to fund adequately each of the following in priority:

4. Reserves for audit purposes;

5. Operating Supplementary budget support for the Research Grants Development Office;

6. Reserve for program development/contingency; and

7. 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 research 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 Research Grants Development Office. Recommendations for expenditures are made by the Director of Research Grants Development and approved by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs 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. Seventy-five percent of the uncommitted overhead will revert to the dean of the school responsible for securing the grant or contract. The dean may use this money for equipment and supplies, travel, student assistance, or research or project development, subject to the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Twenty-five percent of uncommitted indirect cost reimbursements will be available to the University Academic Senate Research Committee, which will
solicit proposals from the faculty for research, development, or and other scholarly and creative activities, equipment and supplies, travel to professional meetings, publication costs, or and recommend grants other projects consonant with the educational functions and policies of the university, subject to the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The program under which the University Academic Senate Research Committee recommends proposals to the Vice President for Academic Affairs is called CARE, for Creative Activity/Research Effort.

The ceiling for the distribution of uncommitted overhead to the University Research Committee and deans is set by the Vice President for Academic Affairs upon recommendation of the Director, Research Development:

Policy for Allocating Incremental Indirect Cost Reimbursements

Thirty percent of the uncommitted overhead will go to the administrative unit directly sponsoring the project (e.g., department, dean's office, institute, or center). Such 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. These activities may include, but are not limited to, support for research assistants, equipment, travel to attend professional meetings, books and journals, and society memberships.

Remaining indirect costs, called incremental overhead, are distributed according to the following formula: 25% to the individual project director for professional development activities; 25% to the department for the promotion of sponsored activities; 25% to the sponsoring unit (institute or center or, if none, the department) for similar activities; and 25% to the Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office.
EXHIBIT A

Overhead Utilization: CAM 543 Present Formula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>84-85</th>
<th>85-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Administered Projects</td>
<td>$237,481</td>
<td>$233,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administered Projects</td>
<td>$44,040</td>
<td>$38,979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAM 543.3 Grants Development and Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>84-85</th>
<th>85-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAM 543.3</td>
<td>$239,238</td>
<td>$271,209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAM 543.5 Uncommitted Overhead

A.S. Res. Committee*  
$4618  $808

Deans*  
$12,388  $2424

CAM 543.6 Incremental Overhead

25% Project Director  
$7680  -0-

25% Department  
$15,360  -0-

25% Center or Institute  
-0-  -0-  (If none, to dept.)

25% Vice President, Academic Affairs  
$7679  -0-

*Fixed price reserve included for ASRC and Deans.
EXHIBIT B

Overhead Utilization: CAM 543 Effect of New Formula if Used 1984-85 and 1985-86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>84-85</th>
<th>85-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Administered Projects</td>
<td>$237,481</td>
<td>$233,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administered Projects</td>
<td>$44,040</td>
<td>$38,979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAM 543.3 Grants Development and Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>84-85</th>
<th>85-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$239,238</td>
<td>$271,209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAM 543.5 Uncommitted Overhead (Fixed-price Contract Reserve)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>60% Academic Senate Research Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Care Grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30% Dept. Dean's Office, Center, or Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10% Project Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: George Lewis, Chair
    Academic Senate GE&B Committee

From: John Culver, Chair
    GE&B Area D Subcommittee

Date: December 2, 1987

File No.: 

Copies: Charles Slem
          Area D Subcommittee:
                  M.L. Anderson
                  Dan Bertozzi
                  Lee Burgunder
                  Bob Burton
                  Pat McKim

Subject: Evaluation of PSY 494

Our subcommittee met several times this Quarter to evaluate the appropriateness
of PSY 494 for possible inclusion into Area D. It is our unanimous recommenda-
dation that this course not be approved for Area D.

In considering any proposed course for Area D, we emphasize the "fit" between
that course and the Area D language in E.O. 338 as well as the Cal Poly Skills
and Knowledge Statement. Specifically, we believe PSY 494 is inappropriate
for Area D for the following reasons.

1. The focus of PSY 494 is too narrow. The justification on the New
   Course Proposal for PSY 494 states, "This course is designed to support
   the proposed Master of Engineering degree program with specialization
   in Manufacturing Systems Engineering. It would also offer a vehicle
   for students (involved in technological change, e.g., Computer
   Integrated Manufacturing Center) to understand the psychological impact
   of their advanced manufacturing technologies on people and organiza-
   tions." The proposers of this course have clearly targeted PSY 494
   for a specific audience which is contrary to the spirit of GE&B courses.

2. PSY 494 does not meet the stated criteria of the Area D language in
   E.O. 338. Courses approved for Area D "should reflect the fact that
   human social, political and economic institutions and behavior are
   inextricably interwoven. Problems and issues in these areas should
   be examined in their contemporary as well as historical setting,
   including both Western and non-Western contexts." While PSY 494 does
   address a human behavior dimension, it does not emphasize the political
   and economic areas of human behavior nor is there an identifiable
   non-Western segment of the proposed course. The Area D Subcommittee
   has been consistent over the years in holding that courses appropriate
   for Area D must address all of the dimensions in the E.O. 338
   language, not just one or two of them.

3. PSY 494 does not meet the appropriate Knowledge and Skills Statement,
   in this instance statement number 6: "Cal Poly graduates, because
   of the increasing international character of society and the growing
   interdependence of nations, should be able to see themselves in
   relation to people of foreign countries, their geography, political
   and economic systems, and religious and ethical values." The focus
   of PSY 494 appears exclusively Western oriented.

Our response to PSY 494 is based solely upon its suitability for GE&B Area
D.4b. We were favorably impressed by the content of the course and wondered
why it was not submitted for consideration as a F.2 course.
1. **PROPOSER'S NAME**  
   Charles Slem

2. **PROPOSER'S DEPT.**  
   Psychology and Human Development

3. **SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)**  
   GEB D.4.B.

4. **COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)**  
   Psy 494  Psychology of Technological Change (3)  
   Examines the impact of technological change on the psychological and social characteristics of organizations. Identification of organizational factors which provide obstacles and opportunities for technological change. Survey of methods of reducing the negative impact of change on people and organizations.  
   **Prerequisite:**  Psy 201/202

5. **SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**  
   Against (unanimous)  
   See attachment

6. **GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**  
   Against (7-0)

7. **ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION**
NEW COURSE PROPOSAL

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Department and School: Psy & HD: SPSE  Date: 1/27/87  Prepared by: Charles Slem and Dan Levi

1. PREFIX / NUMBER / TITLE

Psy 494 — Psychology of Technological Change

3. COURSE DESCRIPTION (follow catalog format; limit to 40 words)

Examines the impact of technological change on the psychological and social characteristics of people and organizations. Identifies personal, social and organizational factors which provide obstacles and opportunities for technological change. Survey of methods of reducing the negative impact of change. 3 Seminars. Prerequisite: Senior level or graduate standing.

5. PREREQUISITE:

Senior level or graduate standing.

7. TITLE FOR CLASS SCHEDULE (maximum of 13 characters)

PSY TECH CHANGE

8. CS NUMBER(S)

C5

9. TYPE OF COURSE

Lec Act Lab Sem Supv

None

10. MISCELLANEOUS COURSE FEE (MC form is also needed)

None

11. NUMBER OF SECTIONS ANTICIPATED

Fall Winter Spring Summer

12. HOW FREQUENTLY COURSE WILL BE OFFERED

Yearly X Alternate Years

13. AVERAGE CLASS SIZE

23

14. ANNUAL W.T.U.

3.0

15. REQUIRED COURSE IN WHICH MAJOR/CONCENTRATION/MINOR

Currently, none; proposed required course in Master of Engineering, specialization in Manufacturing Systems Engineering.

16. ELECTIVE COURSE IN WHICH MAJOR/CONCENTRATION/MINOR

None

17. DUPLICATION OR APPROXIMATION OF COURSES NOW BEING OFFERED OR NOW BEING PROPOSED

None.

18. STAFFING (Indicate either the need to hire new faculty or how present faculty utilization will be shifted to accommodate this course)

No new staffing will be required. Course will be staffed by currently unutilized faculty positions. A shift in teaching assignments within the department may be required.

19. JUSTIFICATION (Explain the need for this course)

This course is designed to support the proposed Master of Engineering degree program with specialization in Manufacturing Systems Engineering. It would also offer a vehicle for students (involved in technological change e.g., Computer Integrated Manufacturing Center) to understand the psychological impact of their advanced manufacturing technologies on people and organizations.

20. FACILITIES, MATERIALS, AND EQUIPMENT NEEDED TO ACCOMMODATE Course

Classroom, AV equipment, library.

Bill A. Slem  Jerry Slem  Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
School Dean  University Dean

*Courses proposed for inclusion in GEB must be submitted to the GEB Committee.
Memorandum

: Charlie Crabb, Chair
Academic Senate

: Vice President for Academic Affairs
and Senior Vice President

Subject: Department Name Changes for 1988-90 Catalog
Foreign Languages to Foreign Languages and Literature
Speech Communication to Communication

Please have the Academic Senate review the proposed department name changes. Correspondence regarding the proposals are attached.

March 1 is the final deadline for changes to appear in the 1988-90 catalog. If the Senate recommends approval after that time, the department name changes may be used, but they will not be shown in the catalog.

Attachments
Memorandum

To: Malcolm W. Wilson  
Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: James R. Conway, Interim Chair  
Speech Communication Department

Subject: Department Name Change to COMMUNICATION

This is in response to the questions you raised concerning the appropriateness of our department changing its name from Speech Communication to COMMUNICATION. We hope that the rationale, and its supporting material, will allow us to proceed with the name change in the 1988-90 Catalog.

The chief rationale for adopting the title COMMUNICATION is that it more accurately describes the character and composition of the discipline. COMMUNICATION represents not only the scope and variety of course offerings, but identifies that concern which cuts across areas of specialization within the department. In this sense, the proposed name provides a least common denominator. It suggests to the student that whichever course in the major is selected, the student may expect that course to deal with the problems and possibilities of human communication.

Supporting reasons may be clustered according to (1) curricular concerns and (2) professional directions.

Curricular

The department currently offers a variety of courses in the arts and sciences of communication. Although these courses do not exhaust all aspects of communication studies, they do exceed the curricular constraints suggested by Speech Communication. A brief review clarifies the point: The major is structured to provide competency in both communication theory and practice, research, and performance in verbal and nonverbal dimensions of communication.

As evidence that the major embraces more than variations on the act of public speaking, the following select list of courses now offered should be considered: Nonverbal Communication, Organizational Communication, Communication Theory, Communication Research, Cross-Cultural Communication. Such variety would seem to argue convincingly for the more general designation offered by COMMUNICATION.

Professional

The literature, organization and administration of the discipline have expanded to meet this growth in communication studies. While it is true that one of the major journals of the field remains The Quarterly Journal of Speech, other publications have adopted the more inclusive term. Prominent journal titles include Communication Quarterly, Human Communication Research, and Critical Studies in Mass Communication. Perhaps the most obvious examples were the changes from Speech Teacher to Communication Education and Speech Monographs to Communication Monographs in the 1970s.
TO: Wilson  
DATE: 4-27-87  
SUBJECT: COMMUNICATION

The move toward COMMUNICATION is reflected further in the fact that a majority of Speech Communication Association voters recently opted for the more appropriate AMERICAN COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION. In addition, it is worth noting that the major administrative body in the field is The Association for Communication Administration. Finally, it is clear that outside of the CSU, there is a nationwide movement away from the use of "speech" in departmental names (see attached). COMMUNICATION describes the variety that distinguishes our discipline and the uniformity of interests which binds us together.

Attached is a list of some of the Speech Communication faculty whose backgrounds and research interests emphasize the quantitative aspects of communication, i.e., empirical research methodology, including experimental and survey research, case studies, and content analysis. If you have further questions, a group of our faculty would be happy to meet with you.

ATTACHMENTS
DEPARTMENT NAMES AT VARIOUS UNIVERSITIES

Departments which blend traditional speech communication functions with a combination of others (drawn from journalism, public relations, film, television, mass communication, etc.) have adopted a variety of names:

Communication
- Purdue University
- University of Colorado
- University of Utah
- University of Tulsa

Communication Studies
- University of Iowa

Communications
- Washington State University
- University of Maryland

Departments performing essentially the same functions as ours have chosen names which more accurately reflect the tasks that range beyond speech presentations:

Rhetoric and Communication
- University of California, Davis

Communication Arts and Sciences
- University of Southern California

Communication Studies
- Northwestern University

Communication
- University of Oklahoma
- Tulane University
- University of Arizona
- University of New Hampshire (in process of dividing Communication & Theatre)
- George Mason University (University of Virginia)
SPEECH COMMUNICATION FACULTY EMPHASIZING QUANTITATIVE ASPECTS
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo

JAMES R. CONWAY, Professor

MICHAEL L. FAHS, Associate Professor

KEITH E. NIELSEN, Professor
Ph.D., Michigan State University. Teaches Communication Theory, Cross-Cultural and Interpersonal Communication. Served as consultant to state agencies for communication training. Authored papers such as "Dialogue as a Mode of Health Communication in a Correctional Facility" and "Genetics and Cultural Communication," Communication Association of the Pacific Journal.

HARRY SHARP, JR., Professor
Ph.D., Purdue University. Teaching at Cal Poly has been primarily in humanities side of discipline, but has conducted survey and experimental research published in various journals including Communication Monographs, Western Journal of Speech Communication, and Journal of Communication.

B. CHRISTINE SHEA, Lecturer
M.A., Ohio University. Teaches Critical Thinking, Public Speaking and Forensics. Senior author of experimental papers, including "Effects of Relationship Type, Partner Intent and Gender on the Selection of Relationship Maintenance Strategies," Communication Monographs.

PATRICIA E. SMITH, Lecturer
RESOLUTION ON
DEPARTMENT NAME CHANGE:
SPEECH COMMUNICATION TO COMMUNICATION

WHEREAS, Changes in the discipline and the department make its name increasingly inaccurate; and

WHEREAS, Faculty in appropriate departments have been consulted and voiced no objections; and

WHEREAS, The change has been requested by unanimous vote of the department and has been endorsed by the school dean; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University endorse changing the name of the Speech Communication Department to Communication Department.

Proposed By:
Harry Sharp, Chair of the Speech Communication Department
February 2, 1988
Memorandum

To: Malcolm Wilson

From: Jon M. Ericson

Subject: Department Name Change Proposal

The faculty of the Foreign Languages Department proposed a change departmental name to:

Department of Modern Languages and Literature

After consultation in the School of Liberal Arts and as a result of deliberation in the School Council, the Council has unanimously endorsed a modified proposal:

Department of Foreign Languages and Literature

The proposed name change is well supported by reasons largely enumerated in the attached memo of April 30 from William Little. It has my endorsement and recommendation for approval.
Memorandum

To: Dean Jon Ericson  
School of Liberal Arts

From: William Little, Head  
Foreign Languages Department

Subject: CHANGE OF DEPARTMENT NAME

Date: 30 April 1987

File No.: 

Copies: Department Heads/Chairs  
School of Liberal Arts  
Foreign Languages Dept.

The FOREIGN LANGUAGES DEPARTMENT would like permission to change its name to the DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES. The petition arises from a unanimous vote by the faculty in the department, and it was approved by the school curriculum committee. The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee would like to know if there are any objections from any other source within our school.

The main reason for wishing to change our name is that our current name does not reflect accurately the nature and scope of our curricula. To be precise, twelve of the thirty-six courses offered by our department are dedicated to literature. The name "Foreign Languages Department" was an accurate description of our reality when we were a lower division service department teaching principally language acquisition skills. Our scope and our methodologies have increased greatly since those days a decade and more ago. We are especially anxious to modify our image through a name change since all levels of the curriculum process are enthusiastically supportive of our proposal to create three new courses on critical reading in our three main modern languages: GER 233 Critical Reading in German (4); FR 233 Critical Reading in French (4); SPAN 233 Critical Reading in Spanish (4). The courses have been proposed for area C.1 in GE&B.

We recognize that the English Department reasonably may object that English is a modern language, and that they teach as high a percentage of literature courses as we do. We believe, however, that the differentiation between English departments and departments of modern languages and literatures throughout the United States is such a general, and workable, custom that there ought to be no real conflict at Cal Poly.

Is it appropriate, by means of this memorandum, to ask that our request for a name change be brought before the School Council?
RESOLUTION ON
DEPARTMENT NAME CHANGE:
FOREIGN LANGUAGES DEPARTMENT TO
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

WHEREAS, The majority of departments in our field have names that reflect our dual reality whereby we teach both language and literature courses; and

WHEREAS, Our department at Cal Poly has matured to the point that we are in line with this national dual reality; and

WHEREAS, We have consulted throughout the campus and have found no opposition to our desire to change our departmental name; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve of a name change for our department from Foreign Languages Department to Department of Foreign Languages and Literature.

Proposed By:
William Little, Head of the
Foreign Languages Department
February 2, 1988