Academic Senate Agenda  
Tuesday, May 10, 1988  
3:00-5:00 p.m.  
UU 220

I. Minutes:  
Approval of the April 26, 1988 Minutes (pp. 7-11).

II. Communications:  
A. Materials available for reading in the Academic Senate office (pp. 3-6).
B. President Baker's response to AS-222-86/PPC (p. 12).
C. President Baker's response to AS-268-88/BC (p. 13).
E. Memo from Geigle to Chairs dated 4/18/88 re Nominees for Faculty Trustee (p. 16).
F. Memo from the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates to Colleagues dated 3/30/88 (pp. 17-18).
G. 1988-90 Academic Senate Election Results (p. 19).

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

IV. Consent Agenda:  
Modification to Resolution on Affirmative Action Facilitators, AS-264-87/SWC (pp. 20-22).

V. Business Items:  
A. Resolution on Common Final Examinations-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, Second Reading (pp. 23-24).
B. Resolution on Timetable for Retention, Tenure, Promotion-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, Second Reading (pp. 25-26).
C. Resolution on General Education and Breadth Transfer Curriculum-Lewis, Chair of the GE&B Committee, Second Reading (pp. 27-32).
D. Resolution on Surveys of Graduates and Employers-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, Second Reading (p. 33).
E. General Education and Breadth Proposal: ARCH 316X-Lewis, Chair of the GE&B Committee, Second Reading (pp. 34-36).
F. Resolution on Sexual Harassment Policy-Duerk, Chair of the Status of Women Committee, First Reading (pp. 37-47).
G. Revised Resolution on Cheating and Plagiarism-Beardsley, Chair of the Fairness Board Committee, First Reading (pp. 48-51).
H. Resolution on Modification of "Application for Leave of Absence With Pay" Form-Adalian, Chair of the University Professional Leave Committee, First Reading (p. 52).
I. Resolution on Criteria for Approval of Leave of Absence With Pay Proposals-Adalian, Chair of the University Professional Leave Committee, First Reading (p. 53).

Continued on Page 2 ----->
Resolution on Membership Requirements for School-wide/Library Professional Leave Committees-Adalian, Chair of the University Professional Leave Committee, First Reading (p. 54).

K. Resolution on Initial Appointments of Tenure Track Faculty-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, First Reading (p. 55).

L. Resolution on the Distribution of Resumes During the Peer Review Process-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, First Reading (p. 56).

M. Resolution on Consolidated Recommendations of Peer Review Committees-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, First Reading (p. 57).

N. Resolution on the Assessment Process at Cal Poly-Lewis, Chair of the General Education and Breadth Committee, First Reading (pp. 58-60).

O. Resolution on Library Acquisition Funds-Colvin, Chair of the Library Committee, First Reading (pp. 61-70).

P. Election of Academic Senate Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary for 1988-1989.

VI. Discussion Items:

VII. Adjournment:
Materials Available for Reading in the Academic Senate Office (F08 2511)

(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


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


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)
### Materials Available for Reading in the Academic Senate Office (FOB 25II)

**Page Two**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</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>
<tr>
<td>1/22/88</td>
<td>Call for Proposals for Academic Computing Enhancement Institute Project Funding (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/27/88</td>
<td>Status Report 3 - FY 1988/89 Governor's Budget (Cal Poly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/88</td>
<td>State Policy for Faculty Development in Public Higher Education (Cal Poly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29/88</td>
<td>Foundation Financial Reports for December 31, 1987 (Cal Poly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb '88</td>
<td>Exploring Faculty Development in Higher Education (Cal Poly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/88</td>
<td>Joint Legislative Hearing on the Master Plan (Academic Senate CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/88</td>
<td>Lottery Funding for 1988-89/General Guidelines (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3/88</td>
<td>CPEC High School Eligibility Study (Trustees of the CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/88</td>
<td>Size, Growth, and Cost of Administration at the California State University (Cal Poly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/88</td>
<td>Request for Proposals for Academic Program Improvement 1988-89 (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/88</td>
<td>Proposal on the Performing Arts Center (Cal Poly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/88</td>
<td>Campus Liability Regarding Personal Property of Faculty Members (Trustees of the CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/88</td>
<td>CSU Admissions Criteria (Academic Senate CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10/88</td>
<td>CPEC Study of State Incentive Funding Approaches (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/29/88</td>
<td>The Teacher/Scholar Summer Institute for Faculty in the California State University, June 12-17, 1988 (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/88</td>
<td>Memo from Kerschner to Campus Presidents re Student Suicide (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8/88</td>
<td>THE ACADEMIC PLANS: Summary of Projected Programs (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/88</td>
<td>Initial Release of Faculty Positions for the 1988 Summer Quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/88</td>
<td>Status Report 4 - Analysis of the 1988/89 Budget Bill: Report of the Legislative Analyst to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (Cal Poly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23/88</td>
<td>Lottery Revenue Budget 1988-89 (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/88</td>
<td>The Future of the Pacific Rim is Now: Opportunities and Challenges for the CSU (The Pacific Rim Commission of the CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/88</td>
<td>Study of Graduate Education in The California State University (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/88</td>
<td>Modified Eligibility Indices for Admission to CSU-Executive Order No 523 (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4/8/88  STATESPENDING LIMIT (background documents relative to Propositions 71 and 72) (Cal Poly)

4/15/88  Teacher/Scholar: Summer Institute for CSU Faculty, June 13-17, 1988 [Conference description and application forms] (CSU)

4/19/88  Recommendations from the CSU Outreach and Recruitment Advisory Committee (CSU)
To: A. Charles Crabb, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker  
President

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION ON CSU TRUSTEE PROFESSORSHIP (AS-222-86/PPC)

Date: April 13, 1988

File No.: 
Copies: M. Wilson  
J. Pieper

This note will confirm our discussion relative to the subject resolution. By way of history, the Executive Committee, acting on behalf of the full Senate, adopted this resolution on July 8, 1986. On August 1, I responded, provided the general policy of the Trustees and indicated that I would follow current consultative procedures should the situation arise and would fully consider any departmental concerns.

On October 14, Lloyd Lamouria forwarded a report from the Personnel Policies Committee, seeking my review of a proposed alternative resolution before taking the matter to the full Senate. I responded on October 21 indicating the resolution was acceptable with one exception. The exception was to change the wording in the last section to indicate that the results of the faculty's consultation would be forwarded to the President for consideration rather than concurrence.

On February 3, 1987, Lloyd again forwarded the original resolution reporting that it had been reconfirmed by the Senate at its January 27 meeting. I have not responded because I had previously indicated the resolution was not acceptable.

I had already indicated that I would follow established consultative procedures and fully consider a department faculty's recommendation. Contrary to the statements and implication of the transmittal memo from the Chair, nonacceptance of the resolution was not bypassing normal consultative procedures. My concern then and now is that current procedures on this issue or on any other consultative matters do not require the President to concur in the results of consultation. To accept a resolution that provides that requirement would remove the decision-making authority of the President for which the President is held accountable by the Trustees. That was the thrust of my October 21 memo indicating that the alternative resolution was acceptable if the word "concurrence" was changed to "consideration."

On this issue and on others, I am committed to collegiality and the utilization of consultative procedures. I am equally committed, however, to not accepting resolutions which would change current consultative processes to remove the decision-making authority of the President.
University staff and I have had an opportunity to review the implications of the subject resolution. Based upon this review, I am approving the resolution and asking the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Business Affairs to carry through with implementing the preparation of the reports. At the same time, I am asking them to work with the Academic Senate to review the specific content, format and distribution of the reports. It is estimated that as presented, implementation will require producing approximately 8,500 pages of material. I would hope that a review of the content, format and distribution of the reports would result in a reduction of the cost factors and workload associated with production of the reports and still meet the intent of the resolution of providing full and complete information on budget issues.
Memorandum

To: A. Charles Crabb, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
    President

Date: April 26, 1988

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION ON INDIRECT COSTS UTILIZATION: CAM 543 (AS-277-88/RC)

I have had an opportunity to review the subject resolution which you transmitted on March 7, and have also received and reviewed a recommendation from the Deans' Council transmitted by Vice President Wilson. A copy of his April 13 memo is attached for your information.

Based upon my review of the recommendations, I am approving the proposed changes in CAM 543 with the following changes:

1. the distribution of indirect costs will be 50 percent to the Research Committee, 40 percent to the Administrative Unit, and 10 percent to the project director; and

2. adding the following wording to the next to last sentence of section 543.5 . . . "including additional support to the individual project investigators."

In addition, this approval is with the provision that the distribution issue will be reexamined after the campus learns how much the State provides for research in the CSU and what constraints will be put on the use of those funds.

The purpose of my modifying the percentage distribution from that recommended by the Academic Senate and the Deans' Council and to include the additional wording is to provide additional incentive to the units developing proposals, without foreclosing the possibility of additional funds going to the individual investigators who are responsible for grants.

By copy of this memo to Howard West, Editor of CAM, I am requesting that he develop and distribute a change in CAM Section 543 as proposed by the Academic Senate with the changes as noted above.

Attachment
Memorandum

To: Warren J. Baker  
President

From: Malcolm W. Wilson  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION ON INDIRECT COSTS UTILIZATION: CAM 543 (AS-277-88/RC)

At its April 4, 1988 meeting, the Academic Deans' Council reviewed the above subject recommendation and voted unanimously to favor the Academic Senate resolution with the final disposition of the uncommitted overhead being 50-30-20 (Academic Senate Research Committee [50], Deans' Office [30], and Project Director [20]), with the condition of reexamining after the campus knows how much the State will provide for research in the CSU and what constraints will be put on the use of that money provided for research and faculty development.

I endorse the recommendation of the Deans' Council and recommend your approval.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairs, Campus Academic Senates
FROM: Ray Geigle, Chair
Academic Senate CSU

SUBJECT: Nominees for Faculty Trustee

DATE: April 18, 1988

Pursuant to the enclosed regulations, I hereby request that you begin the process for developing a list of nominees for Faculty Trustee. The Academic Senate will be reviewing its nominations to submit to the Governor at its January 5-6, 1989 meeting. Because it is necessary to have all of our Senators review the material, timing is of the essence.

Please note that the attached guidelines, "Criteria and Procedures for the Nomination of the Faculty Trustee," were revised. The copy of the guidelines enclosed reflect any newly-added text by underlining; deleted text is reflected with a "/" through each sentence or section so removed.

The guidelines provide specific criteria and procedures to aid you in the process of submitting your nomination(s). Should you have any questions regarding the enclosed document, please feel free to contact this office.

NOTE: All materials must be submitted to the Academic Senate CSU office at 400 Golden Shore, Suite 134, Long Beach, CA 90802-4275, no later than 5:00 p.m., Monday, December 5, 1988.

Please note that we request four copies of each nominee's supportive material.

RG/dh

cc: Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee (to be selected at the Senate's September 7-8, 1988 meeting)
March 30, 1988

Dear Colleague,

For many years, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) has been the sole accrediting agency for the state's high schools. An expanded and more detailed review of the high school academic program has been developed to make accreditation a more effective instrument for academic involvement. For the past two years, the University of California Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, with the cooperation of the Academic Senates of the Community Colleges, the State University, and the University of California, has been working with representatives of the State Department of Education and WASC to develop and pilot the expanded academic review portion of the high school accreditation process.

The central feature of the effort, piloted in 18 schools in 1985-86 and in 73 schools in 1986-87, is the appointment of curriculum consultants from the academic departments of colleges and secondary schools who review the range and effectiveness of the curriculum of the corresponding department in the high school being accredited. You have been nominated as someone who could make a substantial contribution in this role. We would like to ask you to serve as a curriculum consultant in your content area for the 1987-88 school year.

Each curriculum consultant will assist a participating school in the local geographical area. The attached form will be used to match you to a suitable school. You will then be notified of the school which you are to assist. It will be your responsibility to contact the school and schedule a date convenient to you and the high school faculty. Two school visits will normally be scheduled to enable you to assist the department in preparing for the official self-study on which the accreditation and quality review are based. At the option of the school and you as a consultant, follow-up visits may also be scheduled.

Following a one-day training, you will provide the school with expertise in your curriculum area and enable the school to get a fresh and independent perspective on its curriculum. The training session will cover roles and responsibilities, as well as the relation between the curriculum review, the Model Curriculum Standards, Competency Expectation Statements for Entering Freshmen, and the Quality Criteria Review and accreditation criteria.

(OVER)
Approximately 130 high schools are expected to participate in the 1988-89 year. We hope that you will be able to participate. All travel expenses (subject to State Board of Control Rules) will be reimbursed.

If you are able to participate, please return the attached information sheet to

Paul Gussman
State Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

Information on the training sessions and copies of the Model Curriculum Standards and other important materials will be sent to you.

Those of us who have been working on this project feel that it has great potential for strengthening the accreditation review process and the high school academic program generally. Participation by faculty in the review process is essential for its success. We certainly hope that you will be able to join us in this effort.

Sincerely,

Chairs of the Academic Senates

Ray Geigle
California State University

Murray Schwartz
University of California

Karen Sue Grosz
California Community Colleges
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Academic Senate
805/756-1258

ELECTED SENATORS FOR
1988-1990

Statewide Academic Senator (three-year term)
Reg Gooden Political Sciences, SLA

ACADEMIC SENATORS

SAGR
Crabb, A. Charles Crop Science
Grinnell, Robin Agricultural Engineering
Vilkitis, James Natural Resources Management
Wheeler, Robert Animal Sciences and Industry
Wooten, Rudy Food Science and Nutrition
(runoff election presently being held for remaining vacancy)

SAED
Berrio, Mark Architectural Engineering
Borland, James Construction Management
Dwyer, Gary Landscape Architecture
one vacancy

SBUS
Bertozzi, Dan Business Administration
Boynton, William Accounting
Burgunder, Lee Business Administration
one vacancy

SENG
Clark, Neill Engineering Technology
Pokorny, Cornel Computer Science
Seifoddini, Ahmad Industrial Engineering
Walsh, Daniel Metallurgical/Materials Engineering

SLA
Alurista Foreign Languages
Havandjian, Nishan Journalism
MacCurdy, Carol English
Mori, Barbara Social Sciences
Zeuschner, Ray Speech Communication

SPSE
Chambers, William Industrial Technology
Freberg, Laura Psychology/Human Development
Stead, John Industrial Technology
Weber, Barbara Home Economics
one vacancy

SSM
Murphy, Paul Mathematics
Peck, Roxy Statistics
three vacancies

PCS
Aceto, Jeanne Placement Center
Dobb, Linda Library
Memorandum

To: A. Charles Crabb, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
      President

Date: February 8, 1988

Subject: Resolution on Affirmative Action Facilitators (AS-264-87/SWC)

I commend the Academic Senate for its thoughtful background statement and resolution on Affirmative Action Facilitators. It is evidence of the Senate's support of Cal Poly's commitment to Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action.

I am especially pleased by the wording in the second resolved clause: "That the Affirmative Action Facilitator be encouraged to promote collegiality and mentorship between current faculty and new faculty to promote retention of Affirmative Action faculty." Only with the sincere support of Cal Poly faculty members will our efforts to hire and retain minority and female faculty members succeed.

I approve the resolution with the following suggested change in the last resolved clause:

"That the Affirmative Action officer provide an annual report on the Affirmative Action Facilitator program to the Academic Senate in order to determine the success of the program."

I believe that the Senate should receive the report and then direct it to the appropriate committee. Therefore I suggest omitting the words "through its Status of Women Committee."

Please convey my thanks to the Senate membership for their support of this vital program.
Background statement: The most recent effort to help strengthen the Affirmative Action Program was the creation of the Affirmative Action Facilitator position. Through the Affirmative Action Facilitator, each department and unit will assume direct responsibility for Affirmative Action. The Affirmative Action Facilitator helps coordinate departmental efforts with those of the Affirmative Action office to hire and retain underrepresented groups. The Affirmative Action Facilitator is appointed by the program manager. The Affirmative Action office and the Equal Opportunity Advisory Council have held training sessions for facilitators. Their responsibilities are listed below:

1. The facilitator takes an active role as a member of the hiring or selection committee.
2. The facilitator identifies recruitment problems and assesses recruitment efforts.
3. The facilitator recommends strategies to the selection committee for attracting qualified underrepresented groups to apply for the vacant position (e.g., identify sources for generating underrepresented applicants).
4. The facilitator briefs the selection committee on the department’s Affirmative Action goals and timetables.
5. The facilitator ensures that Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action are being addressed according to valid job-related criteria and degree of compliance to employment procedures.
6. The facilitator monitors the selection procedures and advises the committee of any potential adverse impact on underrepresented groups.
7. The facilitator documents Affirmative Action efforts for recruitment.
8. The facilitator informs employees that a policy for accommodating religious observances and practices exists.
WHEREAS, There is no formal document that describes the role of the Affirmative Action Facilitator; and
WHEREAS, The University would benefit by having an official document that outlined the responsibilities of the Affirmative Action Facilitator; therefore, be it
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend that the responsibilities listed in the background statement be adopted by the Affirmative Action officer for use by the Affirmative Action Facilitators; and be it further
RESOLVED: That the Affirmative Action Facilitator be encouraged to promote collegiality and mentorship between current faculty and new faculty to promote retention of Affirmative Action faculty; and be it further
RESOLVED: That the Affirmative Action officer provide an annual report on the Affirmative Action Facilitator program to the Academic Senate through its Status of Women Committee in order to determine the success of the program.

Proposed By:
Status of Women Committee
November 3, 1987
Revised November 24, 1987
Revised December 1, 1987
WHEREAS, Common final examinations may be a valuable means to measure the effectiveness of instruction; and

WHEREAS, Common final examinations are used in some departments where multiple sections of a course are taught each quarter and/or principles covered in that course are necessary for subsequent courses;

WHEREAS, The primary objective of such a common final examination is to determine whether course objectives are being met; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That each department head/chair initiate a discussion of the efficacy of common final examinations in central/core courses by placing the topic of common final examinations on the agenda of a special department meeting to be scheduled in 1988-1989; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ultimate decision to utilize common final examinations be left to individual departments.

Approved: 6 Yes, 0 No
Substitute WHEREAS Clauses for the Resolution on Common Final Examinations
Proposed by Reg Gooden

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California

AS--88/

RESOLUTION ON
COMMON FINAL EXAMINATIONS

WHEREAS, Common final examinations may be an injurious means to measure the
effectiveness of instruction by stifling creativity and forcing instruction to
conform to a common mold; and

WHEREAS, Common final examinations are not the case in all departments although
they are used in some departments where multiple sections of a course are
taught each quarter and/or principles covered in the course are
fundamental to subsequent courses; and

WHEREAS, The primary objective of such common final examinations is to determine
whether course objectives are being met but can also have the unintended
effect of minimizing the objectives by reducing them to the lowest common
denominator; therefore, be it
Background statement: On March 7, 1988, the Personnel Policies Committee unanimously approved the changes indicated on the attached timetable. These changes reflect the committee's concern that there is insufficient time allowed for the following two levels of review:
1. The department head's review of first and second year retention cases.
2. The school peer review committee's review of promotion cases.

AS-88/

RESOLUTION ON
TIMETABLE FOR RETENTION, TENURE, PROMOTION

WHEREAS, A two-day time limit is too short for the department head's review in 1st-2nd year retention cases; and
WHEREAS, The duties of the school peer review committee have increased substantially; therefore, be it
RESOLVED: That the attached timetable be revised as indicated.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
March 7, 1988
Revised April 19, 1988
TIMETABLE FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations Forwarded</th>
<th>Retention (1st-2nd Yr)</th>
<th>Retention (3rd-6th)/Tenure</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review Committee to Candidate</td>
<td>11/30 11/17</td>
<td>1/18/1/11</td>
<td>1/18 1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review Committee to Department Head</td>
<td>12/1 11/24</td>
<td>1/25/1/18</td>
<td>1/25 1/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head to Candidate</td>
<td>12/3</td>
<td>2/15/2/8</td>
<td>2/15 2/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head to Dean</td>
<td>12/10</td>
<td>2/22/2/15</td>
<td>2/22 2/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Peer Review Committee to Candidate</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Peer Review Committee to Dean</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean to Candidate</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>4/1</td>
<td>4/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean to President</td>
<td>1/15</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>4/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>2/15</td>
<td>6/1</td>
<td>6/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the event the established deadline falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the date will be extended to the Monday immediately following that date, except for retention and tenure notification, which must be made prior to June 1.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS—88/

RESOLUTION ON
GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH TRANSFER CURRICULUM

WHEREAS, The Master Plan Renewed calls for a high priority to be placed on improving the rate of transfer of students from California community colleges to the University of California (UC) and The California State University (CSU); and

WHEREAS, The proposal for a general education transfer curriculum has tried to address transfers between all segments of public higher education; and

WHEREAS, The unwarranted expansion of the scope of general education transfer impedes its implementation and undermines the autonomy of individual campuses in the UC and CSU; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the California Polytechnic State University Academic Senate recommend that the application of the general education transfer curriculum be confined to transfer from community colleges to CSU or UC campuses.

Proposed By:
George Lewis
April 5, 1988
REPORT OF THE INTERSEGMENTAL DRAFTING COMMITTEE
FOR A GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER CURRICULUM.

October 28, 1987

RECEIVED

NOV 2 1987

Academic Senate CSU
Chancellor's Office
REPORT OF THE INTERSEGMENTAL DRAFTING COMMITTEE FOR A GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER CURRICULUM

Following a careful, extended process of deliberation and analysis of existing criteria and requirements, the Intersegmental Drafting Committee for a General Education Transfer Curriculum is pleased to submit its recommendations. In doing so, it has been attentive both to its specific charge and to the broader concerns of our society with respect to the general education of our postsecondary student population.

The committee believes that the principal role of general education is to develop the students' abilities to think and that an effective way to meet this standard is to emphasize that most general education courses should require significant amounts of writing. General education courses should not merely transmit information, but should require analysis, criticism, and synthesis. One of the most effective tools for achieving these goals is the written essay, evaluated with attention to the quality of its writing as well as the accuracy of its content. In addition, the committee also notes that speaking, listening, and reading are important abilities that a general education course should foster. Participation in the intellectual and cultural life of our society requires sound ability in verbal communication of all kinds.

The committee also believes that courses in the transfer curriculum should be culturally broad in their conception. They should help students understand the nature and richness of human culture and social structures through a comparative approach, and have a pronounced historical perspective.

Similarly, one of the most useful things that students should get from their general education is an understanding of the modes of inquiry that characterize the different areas of human thought: the nature of the questions that can be addressed, the way questions are formulated, the way analysis is conducted and the nature and limitations of the answers obtained.

The preceding comments should make the clear the committee's intention that the General Education Transfer Curriculum be intellectually challenging; indeed, it must be to do a responsible job of preparing students for entry into the upper division of our demanding four-year institutions and for full participation in the life of the state. It is equally clear that participation in such a curriculum itself requires adequate preparation. Finally, the committee takes this opportunity to reemphasize the importance of high school preparation, and to caution that poor preparation may require students to take remedial courses prior to entry into the transfer curriculum.

Completion of the General Education Transfer curriculum prior to transfer should be recognized as satisfying all lower division general and breadth education requirements of the receiving institution. Any receiving institutions that insist upon the completion of certain of their general education requirements as a prerequisite for transfer must also accept completion of the full transfer curriculum as satisfying that screening requirement. However, the receiving institution may legitimately insist that transfer students complete any general education requirements that must be taken at the upper division level by non-transfer students, or that must be satisfied by all students by upper division course work. In addition, transfer students must fulfill all other admission requirements.
GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER CURRICULUM

Both the State University and the University have a specific American Institutions requirement that is separate from their general education requirements. Completion of the General Education Transfer Curriculum may not satisfy those requirements. Similarly, general education requirements are separate from lower division requirements for the major. Students pursuing majors which require extensive lower division preparation may not find the General Education Transfer Curriculum option to be advantageous.

All courses offered towards satisfaction of the requirements of the General Education Transfer Curriculum must be baccalaureate in level and must be acceptable for transfer among all segments of public post-secondary education. Advanced Placement credit that is considered equivalent to a course accepted for credit towards the Transfer Curriculum should also be acceptable.

PROPOSED GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER CURRICULUM

Subject Area: English Communication (3 semesters or 4 quarters)

The English Communication requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of three semester or four quarters of lower division courses in English reading, critical thinking, written composition, and oral communication, at least two semesters or three quarters of which must be devoted to written composition. Courses in this area shall include close analysis of a variety of representative texts.

The inclusion of a sequence in English Communication in a program of general education is of basic importance to the remainder of the Curriculum. Ability to read at a mature level, to think critically, to write with clarity, and to speak effectively is fundamental to acquisition of knowledge in other areas of the liberal arts. Transmission and exchange of ideas is an essential part of the activity of a liberally-educated citizen. These courses should enable students to go beyond the level of reception and transmission of information and ideas to the more abstract conceptualization of ideas.

Subject Area: Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning (1 semester or 1 quarter)

The Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of a one-semester or one-quarter course in mathematics or statistics.

Courses on the application of statistics to particular disciplines may not be credited towards satisfaction of the Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning requirement.

The increasingly complex, technological nature of the society in which we live routinely confronts us with a variety of information requiring calculation, comparison, and other forms of analysis for problem solving. In addition, many disciplines require a sound foundation in mathematical concepts. The requirement in Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning is designed to prepare students to respond effectively to these challenges.

Subject Area: Arts and Humanities (3 semesters or 3 quarters)

The Arts and Humanities requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of three semesters or three quarters of coursework which encourages students to analyze and appreciate works of intellectual, literary, aesthetic and cultural importance. At least one course shall be taken in the Arts and one in the Humanities. Courses should provide students with some historical understanding of major civilizations and
cultures, both Western and non-Western, including those of ethnic minorities. In the Arts, students should also learn to develop an independent and critical aesthetic perspective.

Courses that are primarily performance or studio classes in the Arts may not be credited towards satisfaction of the Arts and Humanities requirement.

The Arts and Humanities historically constitute the heart of a liberal arts general education because of the fundamental humanizing perspective that they provide for the development of the whole person. Inclusion of this requirement is, therefore, grounded in the deepest traditions of Western education, with its emphasis on language, literature, and the fine arts. At the same time, the great diversity of contemporary American—especially Californian—society adds a vibrant dimension to our received definition of the Arts and Humanities that opens up great possibilities for expansion of that tradition. To focus on the received traditions of the West and the less familiar traditions of other cultures, including the minority cultures in our own society, is to enrich the education of future generations of Californian citizens.

Subject Area: Social and Behavioral Sciences (3 semesters or 4 quarters)

The Social and Behavioral Sciences requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of three semesters or four quarters of coursework which reflects the integration of human social, political, and economic institutions and behavior. Problems and issues in these areas should be examined in their contemporary and historical setting, as well as present a comparative perspective on both Western and non-Western societies, including those of ethnic minorities. Courses should be presented from a theoretical point of view and focus on core concepts of the discipline rather than on personal, practical, or applied aspects.

Not more than one of the courses taken to satisfy the United States History, Constitution, and American Ideals Requirement (Title 5, California Administrative Code, Section 40404) shall be credited towards satisfaction of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Subject Area requirement.

Each of us is born into, lives, and must function effectively within an environment that includes other individuals. People have, from earliest times, formed social and cultural groups that constitute the framework for the behavior of the individual as well as the group. By taking courses in the Social and Behavioral Sciences students will gain a basic knowledge of the cultural behavior and social organizations in which they exist as well as the cultural behavior and social organizations of other human societies.

Subject Area: Physical and Life Sciences (2 semesters or 3 quarters)

The Physical and Life Sciences requirement shall be fulfilled by two semesters or three quarters of coursework which includes at least one course in the Physical Sciences and one course in the Life Sciences, at least one of which incorporates a laboratory. Courses should emphasize experimental methodology, the testing of hypotheses, and the power of systematic doubt, rather than the recall of "facts." Courses that emphasize the interdependency of the sciences are especially appropriate for non-science majors.
The contemporary world is pervaded by science and its applications, and many of the most difficult choices facing individuals and institutions concern the interface of scientific and technological capability with human values and social goals. To function effectively in such a complex world, students must develop a comprehension of the basic concepts of physical and biological sciences, and a sophisticated understanding of science as a human endeavor, including the limitations as well as the power of scientific inquiry.

Respectfully submitted,

Carmen M. Decker, Committee Chair
Department of English and Spanish
Cypress College

Edward A. Alpers, Dean
Honors and Undergraduate Programs
University of California, Los Angeles

Bernice Biggs
Department of English
San Francisco State University

Brian Federici
Department of Entomology
University of California, Riverside

Ray Geigle
Chair, Academic Senate
The California State University

Theo Mabry
Social Sciences Division (Anthropology)
Orange Coast College

Frieda Stahl
Department of Physics & Anatomy
California State University,
Los Angeles

Maryamber Villa
History Department
Los Angeles Valley College

Mark Wheelis
Department of Bacteriology
University of California, Davis

Connie Anderson
Specialist, Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges

Carla Ferri, Coordinator
Undergraduate Admissions &
Articulation
University of California, Berkeley

Chuck Lindahl
Office of the Chancellor
The California State University

EAA/bs: 10/30/87
RESOLUTION ON SURVEYS OF GRADUATES AND EMPLOYERS

WHEREAS, Surveys of graduates one, five or ten (or more) years following graduation can be a valuable source of information about the effectiveness of the education they received and about areas they believe need improvement; and

WHEREAS, A similar survey of employers of Cal Poly graduates can be a valuable source of information about the effectiveness of the education received by Cal Poly graduates; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That such surveys of Cal Poly graduates and employers of Cal Poly graduates be carried out (in conjunction with the Alumni Office and the Placement Center) no less than once every five years; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a representative advisory ad hoc survey committee be established to design the core of a questionnaire to be sent to Cal Poly graduates and employers of Cal Poly graduates; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ad hoc survey committee would solicit input from departments concerning additional department-specific questions to be added to the survey; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the resources necessary to prepare and administer both surveys be supplied by the University.

Proposed by:
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 5, 1988
Revised April 19, 1988

Approved: 6 Yes, 0 No

Note 1: As an example, the committee could be constituted as follows: one representative nominated by the Alumni Office, one representative nominated by the Placement Center, one faculty representative from each school, nominated by the Academic Senate Executive Committee and appointed by the President.

Note 2: The delegation of responsibility by this resolution to an ad hoc survey committee does not preclude a department from undertaking its own survey of its graduates and employers of its graduates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>Sandy Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA</td>
<td>C.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Include section, and subsection if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC.</td>
<td>ARCH 316X California Architecture and the California Dream (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(use catalog format)</td>
<td>Development of California Architecture as the symbolic expression of the myth of the California Dream. Focus of tracing California's unique contribution to architecture and urban patterns in the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</td>
<td>Approves 5-0 (see attachment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</td>
<td>Approves 7-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: George Lewis, Chair
   Academic Senate General Education and Breadth Committee

From: John Harrington, Chair
      Academic Senate C and E&B Area C Subcommittee

Subject: Course Proposal for ARCH 316X

Date: March 21, 1988
Copies: Sandy Miller
         Glenn Irvin

The Area C Subcommittee unanimously approved adding ARCH 316X, California Architecture and the California Dream, to GE&B Area C.3. Professor Miller worked effectively with the committee to revise the proposal after the committee's original negative vote. The committee has only one reservation, but it is a reservation that applies to all C.3. courses: the subcommittee believes that each course in C.3 should require an appropriate prerequisite in Areas C.1 or C.2 (rather than in C.1) given the structure and original logic justifying the three areas. However, the committee will need to address the issue per se rather than focus upon particular courses at this time.
DEPARTMENT: Architecture Dept., SAED
Revised: 2-15-88

**COURSE PROPOSAL**

**FEB 25 1988**

---

**SUBMISSION DEADLINES:**
- Fall Quarter: April 1
- Winter Quarter: Sept. 15
- Spring Quarter: Nov. 15
- Summer Quarter: March 1

---

**COURSE MASTER FILE NUMBER**

(*) to be completed by Academic Programs

---

**EXPERIMENTAL COURSES**

- are normally valid for two years. Please attach an Expanded Course Outline.
- Selected Advanced Topics (470, 471, 570, 571) are valid for one quarter only. Please attach an Expanded Course Outline. If the department plans to offer the proposed course for more than 1 quarter, the experimental course vehicle should be used.
- **Other Subtitle Courses** The catalog description should indicate that the course has subtopics. For the "Prefix/Number/Title" box, please use the information as shown in the catalog. The individual subtopic title should be shown in "Title for Class Schedule."

---

**DEPARTMENT AND SCHOOL**

Dated: 9-30-87
Prepared by: Sandy Miller

---

**1. PREFIX / NUMBER / TITLE**

- ARCH 316X
- California Architecture and the California Dream

**2. UNITS**

- 3

**3. GEB Area:**

- C.3

**4. GRADING METHOD**

- Regular

**5. COURSE DESCRIPTION**

(Follow catalog format; limit to 40 words)

- Development of California Architecture as the symbolic expression of the myth of the California Dream. Focus on tracing California's unique contribution to architecture and urban patterns in the United States.

---

**6. PREREQUISITE**

- ENG 114

**7. QUARTER AND YEAR**

- Fall, Winter, Spring

---

**8. TITLE FOR CLASS SCHEDULE**

- (maximum of 13 characters)

- ARCH / DREAM

---

**9. C/S NUMBER(S)**

- CS 2

**10. TYPE OF COURSE**

- Lec X  Ac Lab Sem Supv

- None

**11. MISCELLANEOUS COURSE FEE**

- (MCF form is also needed)

- None

**12. NUMBER OF SECTIONS ANTICIPATED**

- Winter 1
- Spring 1
- Summer 1

**13. HOW FREQUENTLY COURSE WILL BE OFFERED**

- Yearly X
- Alternate Years

**14. AVERAGE CLASS SIZE**

- 45-50

**15. ANNUAL W.T.U.**

- 9 (3+3+3)

---

**16. REQUIRED COURSE IN WHICH MAJOR/CONCENTRATION/MINOR**

- None

**17. ELECTIVE COURSE IN WHICH MAJOR/CONCENTRATION/MINOR**

- Architecture

---

**18. DUPLICATION OR APPROXIMATION OF COURSES NOW BEING OFFERED OR NOW BEING PROPOSED**

- None

---

**19. STAFFING**

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

- Existing Architectural History Faculty

---

**20. JUSTIFICATION**

(Explain the need for this course)

- California has long been acknowledged as a major trendsetter in national and international architectural circles specifically, and in the arts in general. The awareness of California's unique contribution to the arts should be general knowledge in the cultural background of educated Californians.

---

**21. FACILITIES, MATERIALS, AND EQUIPMENT NEEDED TO ACCOMMODATE COURSE**

- Medium lecture hall (50 chairs); screen; 2 slide projectors with remote control; blackboard; lighting control from full lighting to minimum lighting for note taking.

---

**APPROVALS**

- Architecture Head
- School Dean
- Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
- and University Dean

---

*This form will be returned to the department by the Academic Programs Office with the number noted after a Course Master File catalog number has been assigned by the computer.

**Courses proposed for inclusion in GEB must be submitted to the GEB Committee.
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, is committed to creating and maintaining an environment in which faculty, staff, and students work together in an atmosphere of mutual respect and unconstrained academic interchange. In the University environment, all faculty, staff, and students are entitled to be treated on the basis of their qualifications, competence, and accomplishments without regard to gender. Individuals are entitled to benefit from University programs and activities without being discriminated against on the basis of their sex.

Sexual harassment encompasses a wide range of acts and practices. These include: (1) the use of authority to obtain sexual favors; or (2) other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature that is personally offensive and directed only to individuals of the same gender.

Sexual harassment includes, but is not limited to, making unwanted sexual advances and requests for sexual favors where either (1) submission to or toleration of such conduct is made an explicit or implicit term or condition of appointment, employment, admission, or academic evaluation; (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as a basis for a personnel decision or an academic evaluation affecting an individual; or (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with an individual's work or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, offensive, or otherwise adverse working or academic environment, or adversely affecting any employee or student.

The Chancellor's Executive Order No. 345 requires each campus of the California State University to maintain a working and learning environment free from sexual harassment for its students, and employees, and those who apply for student or employee status.

Sexual harassment is not simply inappropriate behavior, it is illegal. Discrimination on the basis of sex is prohibited by State and Federal Law. ¹

Sexual harassment violates University policy, seriously threatens the academic environment, and is contrary to law. Program Managers and Department Heads/Chairs are urged to take appropriate steps to disseminate this policy statement to students and employees. All faculty, staff, and administrators will be held accountable for compliance with this policy. ¹

¹ Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (as amended); Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; Government Code Section 12940; and Education Code Section 200 et. sec.
IV /// REMEDIES TO SEXUAL HARASSMENT

The policy of the campus is to eliminate sexual harassment and to provide prompt and equitable relief to the extent possible.

Because of the wide range of acts that constitute sexual harassment, appropriate remedies will vary considerably depending on the case. In some cases the situation may be dealt with informally and without formal disciplinary action. In other cases a disciplinary action is clearly called for. The University may independently investigate a matter and initiate appropriate action, including discipline based on an informal complaint and without a formal complaint. The remedy will take into account the severity of the actions alleged as well as the responsibility of the parties involved. The University may pursue remedies such as an apology; removal of an individual from the environment; an educational program; reprimand; or disciplinary action which could result in dismissal, demotion, or suspension without pay. Remedies for substantiated allegations of sexual harassment will be determined by the University.

The University will also determine remedies available to those individuals who are the subject of malicious, false allegations of sexual harassment.

II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purposes of this policy are to:

- implement Executive Order 345 and comply with other governmental regulations prohibiting sexual harassment;
- promote a positive working and learning environment on campus;
- provide Cal Poly faculty, staff, and students with a specific procedure and policy to address sexual harassment;
- provide due process for all parties involved.

This policy applies to cases of alleged sexual harassment brought by, or on behalf of an applicant, student, or employee against an employee or student of the University. Utilization of these procedures does not preclude initiation of complaints with the Fair Employment and Housing Commission or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

II. DEFINITIONS

E. A. Sexual Harassment

In accordance with the Chancellor's Executive Order No. 345, "sexual harassment" includes such behavior as sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature directed towards an employee, student, or applicant when one or more of the following circumstances are present:

- Submission to or toleration of the conduct is an explicit or implicit term or condition of appointment, employment, admission, or academic evaluation;
Submission to or rejection of such conduct is used as a basis for a personnel decision or an academic evaluation affecting an individual;

The conduct has the purpose or effect of interfering with an individual's work or academic performance, or creating an intimidating, hostile, offensive, or otherwise adverse working or academic environment or adversely affecting any employee or student;

In determining whether conduct constitutes sexual harassment the circumstances surrounding the conduct should be considered.

A. Advisor

Advisor means the Sexual Harassment Advisor or employee(s) designated by a Program Manager to receive complaints; to help complainants evaluate their complaints; to inform them of campus policies, procedures and resources; to attempt informal resolution, if desired; and to assist the parties with formal complaint procedures, if necessary. The role of the Advisor is one of mediator between parties rather than the complainant's advocate. The complainant may seek an advocate from other sources.

It is suggested that Program Managers appoint tenured employees as Advisors.

B. Complainant

"Complainant" means a Cal Poly student or employee or an applicant for student or employee status, who files a complaint under this Policy.

C. Program Manager

Program Manager means positions designated by the President, normally at dean/division head level or above. In addition, the Director of the Health Center and Director of Counseling and Testing would be considered Program Managers for administering the Policy only.
P. Respondent

"Respondent" means the student or employee of Cal Poly alleged to have engaged in sexual harassment.

F. Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinator

1. For complaints filed by students, the Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinator is the Associate Dean of Student Affairs responsible for Title IX compliance, or designee.

2. For complaints filed by employees, the Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinator is the Director of Personnel and Employee Relations, or designee.

G. Student

"Student" means a person enrolled as a student, or an applicant for student status at Cal Poly at the time the alleged act of sexual harassment occurred. For the purpose of this Policy, Extended Education students are included.

H. Authorized Representative

"Authorized Representative" means anyone designated in writing by the Complainant.

I. Applicant

"Applicant" means a person who is applying for either student or employee status.

III. EXAMPLES OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

The issue of appropriate and inappropriate relationships between students and faculty, or between staff and supervisors is very complex. Some members of the University hold positions of authority that involve the legitimate exercise of power over others, and it is their responsibility to be sensitive to that power so as to avoid actions that are abusive or unprofessional. Faculty and supervisors in particular, in their relationships with students and supervisees, need to be aware of potential conflicts of interest abuses of power and the possible compromise of their evaluative capacity. Because there is an inherent power difference in those relationships, the potential exists for the loss of powerful/persuasive/controlling elements in suggestions regarding activities outside those appropriate for the professional relationship.

Faculty should be aware that anytime they pursue a sexual/social relationship with a student, they risk a claim of sexual harassment. In like manner, managers and supervisors should realize that whenever they pursue a sexual/social relationship with a subordinate, they risk a claim of sexual harassment. It is the responsibility of faculty and supervisors to behave/instruct in a manner that their words or actions cannot reasonably be perceived as being sexually harassing.
The following examples are intended to be illustrative and educational rather than exhaustive.

**Faculty and Staff**

-- A senior colleague or supervisor directly or indirectly offers to influence a personnel decision (i.e., appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, permanency) in return for sexual favors, and/or suggests action against the employee for refusal;

-- An **employee** offers to support another employee's endeavors in return for sexual attention;

-- A male employee, in the presence of another employee, makes repeated offensive comments of a sexual nature.

-- An employee, in the presence of another employee of the opposite sex, makes repeated offensive comments of a sexual nature.

**Students**

-- An instructor offers a better grade, extra help, or academic opportunity in return for sexual favors, and/or threatens action against the student for refusal;

-- A person supervising a student's job or academic assignment makes repeated sexual comments that interfere with work or the learning experience;

-- An advisor or counselor asks offensive questions of a sexual nature inappropriate to the topic at hand;

-- An unwelcomed touch of a sexual nature from a staff or faculty employee.

-- A staff member hangs up a poster or uses slides or a derogatory cartoon in a lecture that displays women or men in an offensive manner.

**VI. IV. CONFIDENTIALITY**

All procedures under this Policy and all reports filed shall be confidential. All findings taken under this Policy and all reports filed shall be confidential and every effort will be made to preserve confidentiality.
VII. INFORMAL RESOLUTION PROCEDURE

A. Employee Complainants

1. Complainants who are employees covered by collective bargaining agreements which have complaint procedures are required to utilize those procedures. (Currently, the following employee agreements have complaint procedures: Unit 2, Health Care Support; Unit 5, Operations Support Services; Unit 7, Clerical/Administrative Support Services; and Unit 9, Technical Support Services.)

2. Complainants who are employees which are (a) not covered by collective bargaining agreements, or (b) are not covered by a collective bargaining agreement which does not contain a complaint procedure, must utilize Executive Order 419.

B. Student or Applicant Complainants

Complainants who are students or applicants for either student or employee status are encouraged to attempt informal resolution of complaints of sexual harassment by utilizing procedures described in this document. However, Complainants are not required to do so, and a formal written complaint may be filed at any time until the deadline (Sixty (60) working days from the first report of an incident of harassment) for filing a formal complaint has passed.

In seeking informal resolution, a Complainant may obtain assistance from any of the designated Advisors. The Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinators shall maintain and distribute the list of Advisors, upon request.

Advisors will be available to discuss the complaint with the Complainant, inform the Complainant of the informal and formal procedures available for seeking resolution of the complaint, advise the Complainant of applicable deadlines, provide the Complainant with a list of other campus resources available and provide assistance in preparing or resolving complaints of sexual harassment. If the Complainant desires to proceed, the Advisor will assist the Complainant in attempting informal resolution as appropriate.

C. Confidentiality of Informal Complaints

The identity of the Complainant and the details of the informal complaint shall be received in confidence by the Advisor, where no records shall be kept except the date the complaint was filed. The Advisor shall advise the office of the appropriate Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinator of the general nature of the complaint without identifying any of the parties involved.
D. Informal Procedures for Student or Applicant Complainants

1. After consulting with an Advisor, a Complainant may, but need not, attempt to resolve the complaint directly with the person alleged to have engaged in the sexual harassment.

2. If the Complainant is unsuccessful in the attempt to gain an acceptable remedy or does not wish to make direct contact with the alleged person to have committed the harassment, the Complainant may, but need not, attempt to resolve the complaint with the Respondent's Department Head/Chair who is required to notify the Program Manager within three (3) working days of any sexual harassment complaint. If the Program Manager is the person alleged to have engaged in the sexual harassment, the Complainant may, but need not, attempt to resolve the complaint with the Director of Personnel and Employee Relations.

3. If the Complainant is unsuccessful in the attempt to gain an acceptable remedy or does not wish to pursue steps 1 or 2 above, a Complainant may bring the complaint directly to the attention of the Sexual Harassment Coordinator who shall counsel the Complainant about any additional attempt, if any, that might be made to resolve the matter before filing a written complaint.

VII. FORMAL RESOLUTION PROCEDURES

A. Employee Complainant Formal Procedure

Employees not covered by collective bargaining agreements shall utilize Executive Order 419.

B. Student and Applicant Complainants

1. Filing a Formal Complaint

Student and applicant Complainants should utilize the following procedure. Formal complaints shall be filed by a Complainant or his or her authorized representative with the appropriate Sexual Harassment Coordinator. A formal complaint shall be in writing and must include:

a. The name(s), address(es), and telephone number(s) of the Complainant(s) filing the complaint, and his or her Representative(s), if any.

b. The name(s) of the Respondent(s), University title, and department.

c. A specific statement of the acts or practices alleged to constitute sexual harassment, including the dates on which and the locations in which such acts and practices are alleged to have occurred.
d. The remedy requested.
e. The date the formal complaint was filed with the Sexual Harassment Coordinator.

2. Review of Filed Complaint

a. On receipt of a formal complaint, the Sexual Harassment Coordinator shall provide a copy to the Respondent and, within 10 working days, review the complaint to determine whether it meets the requirements covered under this policy. The matter shall be investigated unless the complaint fails to establish a prima facie case as determined by the Sexual Harassment Coordinator.

b. Prima Facie Case

A prima facie case is established when the Complainant presents information which, if unrebutted, would be sufficient to support a finding of sexual harassment affecting a complainant and injury resulting therefrom.

Filing false or otherwise groundless accusations without supporting evidence upon which a finding in the Complainant's favor might be reached do not constitute a prima facie case.

c. If there are deficiencies in the complaint, the Sexual Harassment Coordinator shall inform the person who filed the complaint of those deficiencies and provide the opportunity to amend the complaint. If the Complainant fails to remedy the deficiencies, or if the complaint is not filed within the stated deadline ten (10) working days, the Sexual Harassment Coordinator will dismiss the complaint and inform the Complainant of the reasons.

d. The Complainant may appeal such dismissal to the President of the University by filing a notice of appeal including a statement of the grounds for dismissal made by the Sexual Harassment Coordinator.

e. The President shall decide the appeal within twenty (20) working days and shall either affirm the dismissal or shall direct the Sexual Harassment Coordinator to proceed with processing the complaint.
3. Administrative Reviews

a. Once it is determined to process the complaint, the Sexual Harassment Coordinator shall provide copies of the complaint to the Respondent's Program Manager, Department Head/Chair, and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Respondent will be notified of the decision to proceed with the investigation.

b. The Respondent shall file with the Sexual Harassment Coordinator a response to the complaint within ten (10) working days of receiving notice.

c. The Sexual Harassment Coordinator or designee shall be responsible for conducting an administrative review of the case. The Sexual Harassment Coordinator should endeavor to complete the investigation within thirty (30) working days; extensions to continue an investigation beyond thirty (30) working days must be approved by the President or designee. After a thorough investigation of the case, the Sexual Harassment Coordinator shall provide a preliminary report to the Complainant and Respondent. Both parties shall have no more than ten (10) working days to submit any written response to the preliminary report.

d. After the Sexual Harassment Coordinator has considered the response of the Complainant and Respondent to the preliminary report, he/she shall submit a final report to the President which shall include a recommended remedy with copies to the Complainant and the Respondent.

e. After reviewing the report, the President shall send a written response to the Complainant and Respondent, with copies to Respondent's Program Manager and Department Head/Chair, and the Sexual Harassment Coordinator. Normally this shall be done no later than twenty (20) working days from receipt of the final report from the Sexual Harassment Coordinator. If the President does not dismiss the case, then a copy of the written complaint and the President's decision will be sent to the State University Dean, Affirmative Action, pursuant to CSU policy. If the decision is to invoke disciplinary action, then the appropriate disciplinary action procedure shall be followed.

1. If the Respondent is a faculty unit employee, then the Disciplinary Action Procedure contained in the Unit 3 collective bargaining agreement will be followed.
2. If the Respondent is a nonacademic employee, the discipline will be handled according to statutory State Personnel Board procedures.

3. If the Respondent is a student, the Student Disciplinary Procedures will be followed.

IX. VII. RETALIATION PROHIBITED

No Respondent or other University personnel shall retaliate against or threaten to retaliate against any Complainant, or other person who has made an allegation of sexual harassment. Nor shall any person operating under the jurisdiction of this Policy, attempt to or actually intimidate, threaten, coerce, or discriminate against any person for the purpose of preventing that person from exercising any rights protected by this Policy or from participating in any step of the complaint resolution process under this Policy. In situations where retaliation is alleged, the Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinator will investigate and recommend to the President appropriate sanctions.
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Revised RESOLUTION ON CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM

Background: On January 22, 1986, The Academic Senate Chair asked the Fairness Board and Student Affairs Committees to review campus policies on cheating and plagiarism. The Fairness Board of 1985-86 and 1986-87 worked on a proposal which was brought forth jointly with the Student Affairs Committee and which was passed by the Academic Senate in Spring 1987. The President returned the proposal (unsigned) on June 15, 1987 with comments prepared by G. Irvin. After additional deliberations by the current Fairness Board, a meeting between Board representatives and G. Irvin took place (January 1988) in preparation of a new policy proposal. The new proposal incorporates that which is important to the administration within a policy which is supported by the Fairness Board and is similar to the policy approved by the Academic Senate last year.

WHEREAS, The present CAM policy on cheating is extremely short and lacks definition; 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) in the CAM policy be fully replaced with the following:

674 ACADEMIC DISHONESTY: CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM

The University will not condone academic cheating or plagiarism in any form. The faculty is expected to uphold and support the highest academic standards in this matter. Instructors should be diligent in reducing potential opportunities for academic cheating and plagiarism to occur.

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 questions 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.

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 if he or she denies cheating an appeal is possible through the Fairness Board once the department head of the course of record has been consulted regarding the appeal. Instructors should be confident that cheating has occurred; if there is any doubt, the student should be consulted and/or additional information sought prior to taking action for cheating. Students' rights shall be ensured through attention to due process.

Instructors/should be alert/for 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 addition of disciplinary action.

The Dean of Student Affairs shall determine if any disciplinary action is required in addition to the assignment of a failing grade. Disciplinary actions which are possible include, but are not limited to: required special counseling, special paper or research assignments, loss of student teaching or research appointments, loss of membership in organizations, suspension or dismissal from individual programs or from the University. The most severe of these possible actions shall be reserved for grievous cheating offenses or more than one offense by an individual.

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 proper 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 without credit or originality; use of another’s project or program or part thereof without giving credit.

Policy on Plagiarism. Plagiarism may be considered a form of cheating and therefore subject to the same policy described in Section 674.3 above which requires notification of the Dean of Student Affairs and includes possible disciplinary action (See 674.2). However, as there may be a fine line between plagiarism and editorship/within his/her authority) 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, and further advising that an appeal is possible through the Fairness Board, once the department head has been consulted regarding the appeal. Instructors should be confident that plagiarism has occurred; if there is any doubt, the student should be consulted and/or additional information sought prior to taking action for plagiarism. Students’ rights shall be ensured through attention to due process.

Proposed By:
Student Affairs Committee/
Fairness Board Committee
February 17, 1987
Revised May 3, 1988
The existing CAM section on cheating and plagiarism reads as follows:

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.
Adopted: ____________

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

Background statement: Over the past two years, the University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC) has seen an increase in the number of sabbatical and difference-in-pay leave requests where the proposal is dependent, in all or in part, upon outside funding with an award being announced after the committee's review deadline.

AS— -88/____

RESOLUTION ON MODIFICATION OF "APPLICATION FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE WITH PAY" FORM

WHEREAS, A number of faculty proposals for sabbatical or difference-in-pay leaves depend all, or in part, on outside funding; and

WHEREAS, The University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC) must evaluate and/or rank the sabbaticals and difference-in-pay leave proposals within a time line that may be before an award is made known to the applicant; and

WHEREAS, The UPLC Chair must call both the chairs of the School-wide Professional Leave Committee (SPLC) or Library Professional Leave Committee (LPLC) and the applicant to inquire about the effect on the proposal if funding is not awarded; and

WHEREAS, It would be convenient for the SPLC, LPLC, and the UPLC to know the effect on the proposal when reviewing the application; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That a question "8" be added to the Personnel Form 112, "Application for Leave of Absence With Pay," pertaining to outside funding for sabbatical and difference-in-pay leaves which reads as follows:

8. Have you applied for a grant or other financial assistance for your proposal? _____ YES _____ NO
   a. If yes, describe how funds will be used.
   b. Has the grant or other assistance been awarded? _____ YES _____ NO
      (1) If no, when will an award be announced?
      (2) How will your proposal be affected if an award is not forthcoming?

Proposed By:
University Professional Leave Committee
May 3, 1988
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Background statement: Over the past two years, the University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC) has reviewed a number of sabbatical and difference-in-pay proposals that were poorly written and/or weak when compared to school or library criteria. Although school and/or library committees have ranked these proposals low, they have approved them. The UPLC recommends that if a proposal is weak or poorly written, it should still be forwarded by the school or library committees, but given a negative recommendation.

AS-88/____

RESOLUTION ON
CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF LEAVE OF ABSENCE WITH PAY PROPOSALS

WHEREAS, There are a number of poorly written applications for sabbaticals and difference-in-pay leaves submitted each year; and

WHEREAS, These proposals are ranked low by the School-wide Professional Leave Committee (SPLC) or Library Professional Leave Committee (LPLC) but recommended for approval; and

WHEREAS, Some of these poor proposals will eventually be funded due to low numbers of applications within a school or when approved leaves are subsequently declined due to personal reasons resulting in the poorly written proposals receiving a higher priority ranking than originally intended; and

WHEREAS, Poor proposals should not be funded; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the SPLC and LPLC give a negative recommendation to weak applications before being forwarded to the UPLC; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the "Leave With Pay Guidelines" be modified as follows:

School-wide Professional Leave Committees (SPLC)

C.

3. Reject sabbatical and difference-in-pay applications that do not meet established University and school guidelines.

Library Professional Leave Committee (LPLC)

C.

3. Reject sabbatical and difference-in-pay applications that do not meet established University and school guidelines.

Proposed By:
University Professional Leave Committee
May 3, 1988
Background statement: Currently, membership on all School Professional Leave Committees (SPLC) and the Library Professional Leave Committee (LPLC) is not uniform throughout the University. The University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC) recommends that uniform membership requirements with staggered terms will provide consistency and continuity of membership in deliberating on sabbatical and difference-in-pay leave proposals.

AS-88/ __
RESOLUTION ON MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOL-WIDE/LIBRARY PROFESSIONAL LEAVE COMMITTEES

WHEREAS, Continuity of membership on all School-wide Professional Leave Committees (SPLC) and the Library Professional Leave Committee (LPLC) is not uniform throughout the University; and

WHEREAS, Membership on all SPLC and the LPLC is not uniform throughout the University; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That all SPLC and the LPLC have committee membership of two years with one-half of the members being elected in even years and the other half in odd years; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the "Leave With Pay Guidelines" be modified as follows:

School-wide Professional Leave Committees (SPLC)

A. Membership
   (First paragraph remains the same)
   (Add second paragraph as follows:) Once elected, members of the committee serve two-year terms with one-half of the members being elected in even years and the other half in odd years.

Library Professional Leave Committee (LPLC)

A. Membership
   (First paragraph remains the same)
   (Add second paragraph as follows:) Once elected, members of the committee serve two-year terms with one-half of the members being elected in even years and the other half in odd years.

Proposed By: University Professional Leave Committee May 3, 1988
WHEREAS, The screening process for the appointment of tenure-track faculty is thorough and comprehensive; and

WHEREAS, The department peer review process for the retention of first year tenure-track faculty must be completed in November of the first year; and

WHEREAS, The peer review of first year tenure-track faculty provides little or no information not known during the appointment process; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That initial appointments of tenure-track faculty be made for two years.

Proposed By:
Personnel Policies Committee
May 3, 1988
Background statement:

On September 15, 1987, the Vice President for Academic Affairs sent a memo to the deans with the subject heading "Retention, Tenure and Promotion Cycle--1987-88." The Personnel Policies Committee has reviewed this memo (and attachments) and submits the following resolution.

The September 15, 1987 memo addresses the issue of confidentiality in the following paragraph:

Custodians of the files and PRC chairs are to ensure the confidentiality of those files. There should be no duplication of file materials except for copies made for the candidate or appropriate administrator, or for distribution at PRC meetings. At the conclusion of each meeting, the file custodian (or PRC chair) is responsible to collect any duplicated materials. Duplicated materials must be destroyed by the time PRC deliberations are concluded.

The Personnel Policies Committee recommends that this paragraph should not apply to candidate resumes. The resume is essential for Peer Review Committee members when they are formulating recommendations, and the material contained in the resume is information available to the public. Therefore, we recommend that copies of a candidate's resume may be made available to Peer Review Committee members for use in their offices or at home, etc.

AS--88/___

RESOLUTION ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF RESUMES DURING THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS

WHEREAS, Effective peer review requires reasonable access to reliable information; and

WHEREAS, A faculty member's resume consists of information available to the public (e.g., papers presented, courses taught, etc.); therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That copies of resumes of retention, tenure or promotion candidates may be distributed to Peer Review Committee members for use at times other than Peer Review Committee meetings.

Proposed By:
Personnel Policies Committee
May 3, 1988
Background statement:

On September 15, 1987, the Vice President for Academic Affairs sent a memo to the deans with the subject heading "Retention, Tenure and Promotion Cycle--1987-88." The Personnel Policies Committee has reviewed this memo (and attachments) and submits the following resolution.

The September 15, 1987 memo addresses the issue of consolidated Peer Review Committee recommendations in the following paragraph:

Departmental peer review committee members must be elected by the probationary and tenured faculty of the department. Each school peer review committee must be elected according to school procedures. With respect to the peer review committee's vote, each peer review committee evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of that committee. If peer review committee members choose to submit individual recommendations instead of a consolidated recommendation, then the individual recommendations must be signed. Consolidated recommendations must be signed by every member of the committee supporting that recommendation; those disagreeing with a consolidated recommendation should file a signed minority report which includes written reasons.

This paragraph has been the subject of some debate, and the Personnel Policies Committee has proposed new wording to replace the last two sentences of this paragraph.

**AS--88/**

**RESOLUTION ON CONSOLIDATED RECOMMENDATIONS OF PEER REVIEW COMMITTEES**

**WHEREAS,** There is uncertainty with respect to the use of consolidated recommendations; therefore, be it

**RESOLVED:** That each Peer Review Committee recommendation must be accompanied by one of the following:

1. A majority report and a minority report. Both reports must include substantiating reasons and each report must be signed by those Peer Review Committee members who support the report and the substantiating reasons.
2. Individual recommendations from each member of the Peer Review Committee. These recommendations must include substantiating reasons and must be signed.
3. A combination of 1 and 2 above: A majority report, a minority report, and individual recommendations from those members of the Peer Review Committee who support neither the majority nor the minority report.

Proposed By: Personnel Policies Committee
May 3, 1988
RESOLUTION ON
THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS AT CAL POLY

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the attached "Response of the GE&B (General Education and Breadth) Committee on the Issue of Assessment."

Proposed By:
General Education and Breadth Committee
May 3, 1988
RESPONSE OF THE GE&B COMMITTEE ON THE ISSUE OF ASSESSMENT

The GE&B Committee supports the system of assessment as it has been implemented at Cal Poly. Assessment is comprehensive, overlapping, and an ongoing process at Cal Poly. These assessments allow, (1) faculty to employ a variety of techniques to measure student performance in the classroom throughout the student’s academic career, (2) faculty to make adjustments to their approaches to the classroom as a result of peer and student evaluations, (3) faculty to ensure that the appropriate level of teaching and professional growth is being maintained before retention/promotion considerations, (4) independent accrediting agencies, boards and evaluation teams to verify the professional integrity of various programs and (5) those inside and outside of the academic structure to have confidence that the university as a whole has a program consistent with superior educational and professional standards.

In general, assessment of the educational function at Cal Poly can be categorized into four separate but interrelated components: the University, its academic disciplines and degree granting programs, the faculty, and the students.

The University: the institution is evaluated regularly according to the established standards of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

Degree-Granting Programs: specific degree granting programs at the institution undergo periodic evaluation to continue their professional accreditation. For example, the Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology, National Architectural Accrediting Board, American Council for Construction Education, the American Society of Landscape Architects, and the American Planning Association are involved in assessing and maintaining professional standards with the five departments in the School of Architecture; the 13 accredited programs in the School of Engineering are regularly evaluated according to the standards of the Engineering Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, and the Technology Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology. A number of other degree granting programs are evaluated by their specific accrediting societies. Some disciplines do not have professional accrediting boards; it is common for these disciplines to have an outside evaluation team review their programs every 3-5 years.

The Faculty: all rank and class faculty at Cal Poly are expected to have the terminal degree appropriate to their discipline. Probationary faculty are subject to annual review which includes assessment by peers and student evaluations. Faculty who are to be promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, or Associate Professor to Professor are also evaluated by peers and student evaluations prior to a recommendation. Full professors are subject to post-tenure review according to an established schedule. In order to qualify for retention or promotion, faculty must demonstrate satisfactory classroom performance and related professional activity which includes evidence of professional growth and development.

Students: all incoming students must meet not only the minimum qualifications to enroll in the CSU, but stricter standards for a number of impacted programs on campus. The grades students receive in their courses are based on a number of assessments: exams, laboratory reports, short papers, term papers, homework, oral presentations, and group projects where applicable. Additionally, all students must...
successfully pass the Entry Level Mathematics Test and Junior Writing Exam prior to graduation. Moreover, all students must complete a senior project before the baccalaureate degree is awarded. While senior projects vary considerably depending upon the student's major, their intent is to demonstrate a student's research and writing capabilities.

Some have suggested that examinations at the time of graduation would enable us to better assess our educational programs. Such a testing program would be redundant to the extensive student examination program already in place. Our students currently average around forty examinations each academic year.

There is one important aspect of higher education that is extremely difficult to evaluate. All of our programs, and particularly GE&B, prepare our students to begin a lifelong individual educational process. How well that process is implanted in our students is a key to their success, including the contribution they make to our society, many years after graduation. There is no known method for evaluating this process, primarily because of the length of time involved before it has an impact. In addition, the process is strongly affected by many other factors in the graduate's environment besides their undergraduate education.

The GE&B Committee believes that the current assessment tools used at Cal Poly are more than adequate. The development of more assessment tools would simply increase the cost of operating the institution without enhancing the evaluation of its performance.
WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s mission as a polytechnical university within the California State University system precipitates the need for more expensive technical and science-oriented publications; and

WHEREAS, Periodical and book prices continue to rise at inflation rates higher than the rise in the Consumer Price Index; and

WHEREAS, The inflation rate for books will have increased 18 percent from 1985/86 to 1988/89; and

WHEREAS, The inflation rate for periodicals will have increased 30 percent from 1985/86 to 1988/89; and

WHEREAS, The acquisition budgets for both books and periodicals will have increased only 1.99 percent from 1985/86 to 1988/89; and

WHEREAS, The resulting loss of purchasing power has seriously reduced the number of new book and periodical titles that can be acquired by the Library; and

WHEREAS, The continuous depletion of book and periodical buying power will have a direct negative impact on the entire student/faculty body; and

WHEREAS, Faculty members from all schools within the University have expressed concern about their increasing inability to secure new journals; and

WHEREAS, The need to retain core periodical and serial subscriptions has substantially reduced the funds available for books; and

WHEREAS, The diminution of book funds does not allow the Library to adequately maintain current levels of curricular support or sustain new course requirements; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate support restoration of book and periodical inflationary adjustments to the annual Library materials budget formula and send a copy of this resolution to the statewide Academic Senate and the Chancellor’s Office.

Proposed By:
Library Committee
May 3, 1988
There has not been a time in the recent history of the Library when the budget shortfall has been as critical as it now is. No longer does the Library have the ability to procure books, periodicals, and serials that will adequately support the instructional and research needs of the University community. The acquisition budget has simply not kept pace with inflation. The impact of this is illustrated as follows:

Point 1: Flat Budget

---During the past three years the budget has increased less than 1% per year.
Point 2: Inflation

---While the budget increase has averaged less than 1% per year over the past three years, the inflation rate for books, periodicals, and serials has been substantial.
Point 3: A Dilemma

--This dilemma, i.e. a flat acquisitions budget vs. a precipitous inflation rate of books and periodicals has had and will have a devastating impact.

--If no further cuts are made in either periodicals or serials and if the budget does not receive a substantial augmentation, then the 1988/89 scenario will be:

1. $573,000 will be required to maintain the current periodical subscription base of 3,030 titles compared to the $459,000 spent for 3,230 titles just three years ago.

2. $323,400 will be required to maintain the current serials subscription base of 2,180 titles compared to the $298,000 spent for 2,680 titles just three years ago.

3. Only $317,000 will be left to purchase only 6,890 volumes as compared to the $433,000 spent for 11,560 volumes just three years ago.

--Though 200 periodical titles have been cut, their costs have absorbed an increasing portion of the budget causing fewer book and serials purchases.

--The Library has received over 230 requests for new periodical subscriptions -- present funding makes it impossible to procure any of these without cuts in the current subscription base.
Point 4: What if...

--If the same budget/inflation rate scenario extends into the next three years, the procurement of periodicals will compare as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Periodical Dollars Spent/Estimated</td>
<td>459,000</td>
<td>573,000</td>
<td>727,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodical Titles Acquired</td>
<td>3,230</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td>3,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Point 4: What if ... (continued)

--If the same budget/inflation rate scenario extends into the next three years, the procurement of serials will compare as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serial Dollars Spent/Estimated</td>
<td>298,131</td>
<td>278,000</td>
<td>439,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Titles Acquired</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>2,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Point 4: What if ... (continued)

--If the same budget/inflation rate scenario extends into the next three years, the procurement of books will compare as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book Dollars Spent/Estimated</td>
<td>432,790</td>
<td>317,300</td>
<td>70,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Volumes Acquired</td>
<td>11,560</td>
<td>6,890</td>
<td>1,246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Point 5: Misery Has Company

--Cornell University cut its 1987 purchases by 60,000 volumes.

--Stanford University would have faced a $600,000 deficit for library materials if it had not cut acquisitions.

--UCLA had to make "drastic entrenchments".

--40,000 volumes were not purchased in CSU libraries because of insufficient funds.

--1,550 periodical titles were cancelled or deferred in CSU libraries because of insufficient funds.

--Acquisition of phono discs, music scores, micro forms, micro software, and videos have been curtailed throughout CSU libraries.

Point 6: The Solution

--Obviously an infusion of dollars at least sufficient to keep pace with inflation would retain a status-quo collection.

--Improvement of the dollar value abroad (foreign journals anticipate a 30% inflation rate next year) and curtailment of discriminatory pricing policies.

--Supplementary fund raising via "adopt-a-journal", Library Associates (contributed approximately $8,000 to Library this past year), and other programs.

--A recognition by budget-making authorities of the critical nature of the problem. (A resolution is being prepared by Cal Poly's Academic Senate and the state-wide Academic Senate.)

--Without the infusion of funds continued entrenchment of periodical and serial titles will be necessary.

--A concerted effort by academic librarians to inform certain publishers that their unreasonable profit ratios and price escalation will precipitate united action that will in the long range erode their profitability.
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California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, is committed to creating and maintaining an environment in which faculty, staff, and students work together in an atmosphere of mutual respect and unconstrained academic interchange. In the University environment, all faculty, staff, and students are entitled to be treated on the basis of their qualifications, competence, and accomplishments without regard to gender. Individuals are entitled to benefit from University programs and activities without being discriminated against on the basis of their sex.

Sexual harassment includes, but is not limited to, making unwanted sexual advances and requests for sexual favors where either (1) submission to or tolerance of such conduct is made an explicit or implicit term or condition of appointment, employment, admission, or academic evaluation; (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as a basis for a personnel decision or an academic evaluation affecting an individual; or (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with an individual's work or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, offensive or otherwise adverse working or academic environment, or adversely affecting any employee or student.

The Chancellor's Executive Order No. 345 requires each campus of the California State University to maintain a working and learning environment free from sexual harassment for its students, and employees, and those who apply for student or employee status.

Sexual harassment is not simply inappropriate behavior, it is illegal.

Discrimination on the basis of sex is prohibited by State and Federal Law. ¹

Sexual harassment violates University policy, seriously threatens the academic environment, and is contrary to law. Program Managers and Department Heads/Chairs are URGED TO/TAKING RESPONSIBLE FOR TAKING appropriate steps to disseminate this policy statement to students and employees. All faculty, staff, and administrators will be held accountable for compliance with this policy (BASED ON CASE LAW). ¹

¹ Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (as amended); Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; Government Code Section 12940; and Education Code Section 200 et. sec.
The policy of the campus is to eliminate AND PREVENT sexual harassment and to provide prompt and equitable relief to the extent possible WHEN SUCH ACTIVITY IS REPORTED OR OBSERVED.

Because of the wide range of acts that constitute sexual harassment, appropriate remedies will vary considerably depending on the case. In some cases the situation may be dealt with informally and without formal disciplinary action. In other cases a disciplinary action is clearly called for. The University may independently investigate a matter and initiate appropriate action, including discipline based on an informal complaint and without a formal complaint. The remedy will take into account the severity of the actions alleged as well as the responsibility of the parties involved. The University may pursue remedies such as an apology; removal of an individual from the environment; an educational program; reprimand; or disciplinary action which could result in dismissal, demotion, or suspension without pay. Remedies for substantiated allegations of sexual harassment will be determined by the University.

The University will also determine remedies available to those individuals who are the subject of malicious, false allegations of sexual harassment.

/II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purposes of this policy are to:

- implement Executive Order 345 and comply with other governmental regulations prohibiting sexual harassment;
- promote a positive working and learning environment on campus;
- provide Cal Poly faculty, staff, and students with a specific procedure and policy to address sexual harassment;
- provide due process for all parties involved.

This policy applies to cases of alleged sexual harassment brought by, or on behalf of an applicant, student, or employee against an employee or student of the University. Utilization of these procedures does not preclude initiation of complaints with the Fair Employment and Housing Commission or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

/III. DEFINITIONS

/E. A. Sexual Harassment

In accordance with the Chancellor's Executive Order No. 345, "sexual harassment" includes such behavior as sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature directed towards an employee, student, or applicant when one or more of the following circumstances are present:

-- Submission to or tolerance of such conduct BY AN INDIVIDUAL, is an explicit or implicit term or condition of appointment, employment, admission, or academic evaluation;
Submission to or rejection of such conduct is used as a basis for a personnel decision or an academic evaluation affecting an individual;

The conduct has the purpose or effect of interfering with an individual’s work or academic performance, or creating an intimidating, hostile, offensive, or otherwise adverse working or academic environment or adversely affecting an employee or student;

In determining whether conduct constitutes sexual harassment the circumstances surrounding the conduct should be considered.

A/ B. Advisor

The/Advisory/Affirmative/Action/Coordination/ or employee(s) designated by a Program Manager to receive complaints; to help complainants evaluate their complaints; to inform them of campus policies, procedures and resources; to attempt informal resolution if desired; and to assist the parties with formal complaint procedures, if necessary. The role of the Advisor is one of mediator between parties rather than the complainant's advocate. The complainant may seek an advocate from other sources.

It is suggested that Program Managers appoint tenured employees as Advisors.

A/ C. Complainant

"Complainant" means a Cal Poly student or employee or an applicant for student or employee status, who files a complaint under this Policy.

A/ D. Program Manager

Program Manager means positions designated by the President, normally at dean/division head level or above. In addition, the Director of the Health Center and Director of Counseling and Testing would be considered Program Managers for administering the Policy only.
F. Sexual Harassment Compliant Coordinator

1. For complaints filed by students, the Sexual Harassment Compliant Coordinator is the Associate Dean of Student Affairs responsible for Title IX compliance, or designee.

2. For complaints filed by employees, the Sexual Harassment Compliant Coordinator is the Director of Personnel and Employee Relations, or designee.

G. Student

"Student" means a person enrolled as a student, or an applicant for student status at Cal Poly at the time the alleged act of sexual harassment occurred. For the purpose of this Policy, Extended Education students are included.

H. Authorized Representative

"Authorized Representative" means anyone designated in writing by the Complainant.

I. Applicant

"Applicant" means a person who is applying for either student or employee status.

J. "Days" means working days to reflect the employment status of the individuals involved.

III. EXAMPLES OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

The issue of appropriate and inappropriate relationships between students and faculty, or between staff and supervisors is very complex. Some members of the University hold positions of authority that involve the legitimate exercise of power over others, and it is their responsibility to be sensitive to that power so as to avoid actions that are abusive or unprofessional. Faculty and supervisors in particular, in their relationships with students and supervisees, need to be aware of potential effects of unintended abuse of power and the possible compromise of their evaluative capacity. Because of the inherent power difference in such relationships, faculty and supervisors should be aware of possible sexual harassment and take appropriate steps to prevent it. Faculty and supervisors should encourage students to discuss any concerns they have about their relationship with faculty, or others, with a trusted individual, such as the Dean of Student Affairs. Faculty and supervisors should be willing to listen and to act to prevent any sexual harassment.
The following examples are intended to be illustrative and educational rather than exhaustive.

**Faculty and Staff**

-- A senior colleague or supervisor directly or indirectly offers to influence a personnel decision (i.e., appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, permanency) in return for sexual favors, and/or suggests action against the employee for refusal;

-- An employee offers to support another employee's endeavors in return for sexual attention;

-- An employee, in the presence of another employee of the opposite sex, makes repeated offensive comments of a sexual nature.

**Student**

-- An instructor offers a better grade, extra help, or academic opportunity in return for sexual favors, and/or threatens action against the student for refusal;

-- A person supervising a student's job or academic assignment makes repeated sexual comments that interfere with work or the learning experience;

-- An advisor or counselor asks offensive questions of a sexual nature inappropriate to the topic at hand;

-- An unwelcomed touch of a sexual nature from a staff or faculty employee.

-- A staff member hangs up a poster or uses slides or a derogatory cartoon in a lecture that display women or men in an offensive manner.

**VI. IX. CONFIDENTIALITY**

All findings taken under this Policy and all reports filed under this Policy are confidential and every effort will be made to preserve confidentiality.
XVI. INFORMAL RESOLUTION PROCEDURE

A. Employee Complainants

1. Complainants who are employees covered by collective bargaining agreements which have complaint procedures are required to utilize those procedures. (Currently, the following employee agreements have complaint procedures: Unit 2, Health Care Support; Unit 3, FACULTY; Unit 5, Operations Support Services; Unit 7, Clerical/Administrative Support Services; and Unit 9, Technical Support Services.)

2. Complainants who are employees which are (a) not covered by collective bargaining agreements, or (b) are not covered by a collective bargaining agreement which does not contain a complaint procedure, must utilize Executive Order 419.

B. Student or Applicant Complainants

Complainants who are students or applicants for either student or employee status are encouraged to attempt informal resolution of complaints of sexual harassment by utilizing procedures described in this document. However, Complainants are not required to do so, and a formal written complaint may be filed at any time until the deadline (Sixty (60) working days from the first report of an incident of harassment) for filing a formal complaint has passed.

In seeking informal resolution, a Complainant may obtain assistance from any of the designated Advisors. The Sexual Harassment/Compliance Coordinators shall maintain and distribute the list of Advisors, upon request.

Advisors will be available to discuss the complaint with the Complainant, inform the Complainant of the informal and formal procedures available for seeking resolution of the complaint, advise the Complainant of applicable deadlines, provide the Complainant with a list of other campus resources available and provide assistance in preparing or resolving complaints of sexual harassment. If the Complainant desires to proceed, the Advisor will assist the Complainant in attempting informal resolution as appropriate.

C. Confidentiality of Informal Complaints

The identity of the Complainant and the details of the informal complaint shall be received in confidence by the Advisor, where no records shall be kept except the date the complaint was filed. The Advisor shall advise the office of the appropriate Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinator of the general nature of the complaint without identifying any of the parties involved.
D. Informal Procedures for Student or Applicant Complainants

1. After consulting with an Advisor, a Complainant may, but need not, attempt to resolve the complaint directly with the person alleged to have engaged in the sexual harassment.

2. If the Complainant is unsuccessful in the attempt to gain an acceptable remedy or does not wish to make direct contact with the alleged person to have committed the harassment, the Complainant may, but need not, attempt to resolve the complaint with the Respondent's Department Head/Chair who is required to notify the Program Manager within three (3) working days of any sexual harassment complaint. If the Program Manager is the person alleged to have engaged in the sexual harassment, the Complainant may, but need not, attempt to resolve the complaint with the Director of Personnel and Employee Relations.

3. If the Complainant is unsuccessful in the attempt to gain an acceptable remedy or does not wish to pursue steps 1 or 2 above, a Complainant may bring the complaint directly to the attention of the Sexual Harassment Complaint Coordinator who shall counsel the Complainant about any additional attempt, if any, that might be made to resolve the matter before filling a written complaint.

VIII. VI

FORMAL RESOLUTION PROCEDURES

A. Employee Complainant Formal Procedure

Employees not covered by collective bargaining agreements shall utilize Executive Order 419.

B. Student and Applicant Complainants

1. Filing a Formal Complaint

Student and applicant Complainants should utilize the following procedure. Formal complaints shall be filed by a Complainant or his or her authorized representative with the appropriate Sexual Harassment Complaint Coordinator. A formal complaint shall be in writing and must include:

a. The name(s), address(es), and telephone number(s) of the Complainant(s) filing the complaint, and his or her Representative(s), if any.

b. The name(s) of the Respondent(s), University title, and department.

c. A specific statement of the acts or practices alleged to constitute sexual harassment, including the dates on which and the locations in which such acts and practices are alleged to have occurred.
The remedy requested by the Complainant.

The date the formal complaint was filed with the Sexual Harassment Coordinator.

2. Review of Filed Complaint

a. On receipt of a formal complaint, the Sexual Harassment Coordinator shall IMMEDIATELY provide a copy to the Respondent and, within 10 working days, review the complaint to determine whether it meets the requirements covered under this policy. The matter shall be investigated unless the complaint fails to establish a prima facie case as determined by the Sexual Harassment Coordinator.

b. Prima Facie Case

A prima facie case is established when the Complainant presents information which, if unrebutted, would be sufficient to support a finding of sexual harassment affecting a complainant and injury resulting therefrom.

Information submitted must include:

- A description of the actions that appear to create a hostile environment and the consequences of those actions.
- Information necessary to determine the credibility of the complaint.

If there are deficiencies in the complaint, the Sexual Harassment Coordinator shall inform the person who filed the complaint of those deficiencies in writing and provide the opportunity to amend the complaint. If the Complainant fails to remedy the deficiencies, or if the complaint is not filed within 10 working days, the Sexual Harassment Coordinator will dismiss the complaint and inform the Complainant of the reasons.

c. The Complainant may appeal such dismissal to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by filing a notice of appeal including a statement of the grounds for dismissal made by the Sexual Harassment Coordinator within ten (10) working days.

d. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall decide the appeal within twenty (20) working days and shall either affirm the dismissal or shall direct the Sexual Harassment Coordinator to proceed with processing the complaint.

[Signature]
[Name]

Office of Academic Affairs
Once it is determined to process the complaint, the Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinator shall provide copies of the complaint to the Respondent’s Program Manager, Department Head/Chair, and Provost Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Respondent will be notified of the decision to proceed with the investigation.

b. The Respondent shall file with the Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinator a response to the complaint within ten (10) working days of receiving notice.

c. The Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinator or designee shall be responsible for conducting an administrative review of the case. The Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinator should endeavor to complete the investigation within thirty (30) working days; extensions to continue an investigation beyond thirty (30) working days must be approved by the President or designee. After a thorough investigation of the case, the Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinator shall provide a preliminary report to the Complainant and Respondent. Both parties shall have thirty (30) working days to submit any written response to the preliminary report.

d. After the Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinator has considered the response of the Complainant and Respondent to the preliminary report, he/she shall submit a final report to the President which shall include a recommended remedy with copies to the Complainant and the Respondent.

e. After reviewing the report, the President shall send a written response to the Complainant and Respondent, with copies to Respondent’s Program Manager and Department Head/Chair, and to the Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinator. Normally this shall be done no later than thirty calendar twenty (20) working days from receipt of the final report from the Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinator. If the President does not dismiss the case, then a copy of the written complaint and the President’s decision will be sent to the State University Dean, Affirmative Action, pursuant to CTS policy. If the decision is to invoke disciplinary action, then the appropriate disciplinary action procedure shall be followed.

1. If the Respondent is a faculty unit employee, then the Disciplinary Action Procedure contained in the Unit 3 collective bargaining agreement will be followed.
2. If the Respondent is a nonacademic employee, the discipline will be handled according to statutory State Personnel Board procedures.

3. If the Respondent is a student, the Student Disciplinary Procedures will be followed.

VII. RETALIATION PROHIBITED

No Respondent or other University personnel shall retaliate against or threaten to retaliate against any Complainant, or other person who has made an allegation of sexual harassment. Nor shall any person operating under the jurisdiction of this Policy, attempt to or actually intimidate, threaten, coerce, or discriminate against any person for the purpose of preventing that person from exercising any rights protected by this Policy or from participating in any step of the complaint resolution process under this Policy. In situations where retaliation is alleged, the Sexual Harassment Coordinator will investigate and recommend to the President appropriate sanctions.
Point 5: The Problems of Poly

--Cal Poly's funding problems are disproportionate to those of other academic institutions because of its polytechnic-oriented curriculum. For example:

--The Library's average cost for a subscription is $168.22 which is 74.6 percent higher than the $96.36 given as the national average.*

--The average cost per subscription in the science/technology areas is:

1) Biology - $342.75 (up 55.6% from $220.22 in '84)
2) Chemistry - $31.76 (up 52.9% from 489.89 in '84)
3) Civil Engr - $188.54 (up 59.8% from 118.05 in '84)
4) Mathematics - $335.44 (up 67.7% from 200.06 in '84)
5) Physics - $414.63 (up 68.5% from 246.04 in '84)

--Many science/technology journals are only available from foreign publishers. Consequently Cal Poly tends to have a higher proportion of its subscriptions come from abroad (approximately 33%). The dollar decline plus an exceptionally high profit ratio of those publishers has escalated costs of all foreign publications. For example the average cost of foreign periodicals is $250.30 compared to $143.96 for domestic publications.

--Cal Poly's relative isolation from other major library collections also exacerbates the problem. A visit to Berkeley, Stanford, UCLA, and USC is not easily accomplished. Furthermore, reliance on other CSU libraries via interlibrary loan may prove problematic. It has been estimated that inadequate acquisition budgets within the CSU during the past year resulted in:

--40,000 book volumes not being purchased
--1,550 periodical titles being cancelled
--acquisition of phonodiscs, music scores, micro forms, micro software, and videos being curtailed.

*Based on Ebsco Subscription base of 2,542 periodicals and data from the Library Materials Price Index Committee of the American Library Association.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Background statement: Over the past two years, the University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC) has reviewed a number of sabbatical and difference-in-pay proposals that were poorly written and/or weak when compared to school or library criteria. Although school and/or library committees have ranked these proposals low, they have approved them. The UPLC recommends that if a proposal is weak or poorly written, it should still be forwarded by the school or library committees, but given a negative recommendation.

AS-—88/____

RESOLUTION ON
CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF LEAVE OF ABSENCE WITH PAY PROPOSALS

WHEREAS, There are a number of poorly written applications for sabbaticals and difference-in-pay leaves submitted each year that are poorly written and/or weak when compared to school or library criteria; and

WHEREAS, These proposals are ranked low by the School-wide Professional Leave Committee (SPLC) or Library Professional Leave Committee (LPLC) but recommended for approval; and

WHEREAS, Some of these poorly proposals will eventually be funded due to low numbers of applications within a school or when approved leaves are subsequently declined due to personal reasons resulting in the poorly written proposals receiving a higher priority ranking than originally intended; and

WHEREAS, Poorly written proposals should not be funded; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the SPLC and LPLC give a negative recommendation to poorly written applications that are forwarded to the UPLC for approval that do not meet school or library criteria; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the “Leave With Pay Guidelines” be modified as follows:

School-wide Professional Leave Committees (SPLC)

C. 3. Reject sabbatical and difference-in-pay applications that do not meet established University and school guidelines.

Library Professional Leave Committee (LPLC)

C. 3. Reject sabbatical and difference-in-pay applications that do not meet established University and school guidelines.

Proposed By:
University Professional Leave Committee
May 3, 1988
May 10, 1988
WHEREAS, Surveys of graduates one, five or ten (or more) years following graduation can be a valuable source of information about the effectiveness of the education they received and about areas they believe need improvement; and

WHEREAS, A similar survey of employers of Cal Poly graduates can be a valuable source of information about the effectiveness of the education received by Cal Poly graduates; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That each Department, at its option, may carry out such surveys (in conjunction with the Alumni Office and the Placement Center) no less than once every five years; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the resources necessary to prepare and administer both surveys be supplied by the University.

Proposed by:
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 5, 1988

Approved: 6 Yes, 0 No
Presented to Executive Committee: 3/01/88
Returned to Instruction Committee: 3/11/88
Revised by Instruction Committee: 4/07/88
Revised by Instruction Committee: 5/03/88