I. Minutes:
   Approval of the October 4, 1988 Minutes of the Academic Senate (pp. 2-3).

II. Communication(s):
   A. Materials available for reading in the Academic Senate office (p. 4).
   B. Statewide Academic Senate Resolutions Passed on State Propositions 78 and 102 (pp. 5-8).
   C. Resolution approved by President Baker:
      AS-246-87/SA&FBC Resolution on Cheating and Plagiarism

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

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
   Resolution to Amend Procedures for Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee (pp. 9-12).

VI. Discussion Item(s):
   Report of the Academic Senate Ad Hoc Review Committee. This report will go to all faculty on November 1, 1988 for their review and comments. Please review this document carefully and be prepared to discuss any concerns you may have about the proposed report prior to its release to all faculty. (pp. 13-27).

VII. Adjournment:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/6/88</td>
<td>Revised Trustee Policy on Student Health Services (CSU)</td>
<td>CSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/88</td>
<td>Materials on Student Suicide (CSU)</td>
<td>CSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/14/88</td>
<td>Guidelines for Allocation of Funds Received Through the Program Change Proposal on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (CSU)</td>
<td>CSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/88</td>
<td>Draft of Joint Committee Report on the Master Plan (California Legislature)</td>
<td>California Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/5/88</td>
<td>&quot;Profile of CSU Employees - Fall 1987&quot; (CSU)</td>
<td>CSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/88</td>
<td>Retention, Tenure and Promotion Cycle--1988/89 (materials initiating the 1988-89 faculty personnel action cycle) (Cal Poly)</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13-14/88</td>
<td>Meeting of the Board of Trustees Agenda (CSU)</td>
<td>CSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/88</td>
<td>Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual (CSU)</td>
<td>CSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/88</td>
<td>Status of Academic Senate CSU Resolutions (most recent resolutions that have been acted upon) (Academic Senate CSU)</td>
<td>Academic Senate CSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/23/88</td>
<td>Hispanic Underrepresentation: A Call for Reinvestment and Innovation [Hispanic Commission Follow-up Report] (CSU)</td>
<td>CSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/23/88</td>
<td>Principles and Policies: Papers of the Academic Senate of The California State University (Academic Senate CSU)</td>
<td>Academic Senate CSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairs, Campus Academic Senates
FROM: Bernice Biggs, Chair
Governmental Affairs Committee
Academic Senate CSU

SUBJECT: Statewide Academic Senate Resolutions Passed on State Propositions 78 and 102

Attached are copies of two resolutions passed by the statewide Academic Senate at its September 8, 1988 plenary session. AS-1825-88/GA is in support of Proposition 78, Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1988, in which we have a large stake. AS-1826-88/GA opposes Proposition 102 (Dannemeyer) which contains requirements on AIDS testing which we felt it important to take a stand against.

Will you please refer these resolutions to your Governmental Affairs Specialist for whatever campus dissemination seems appropriate. (Both of these resolutions were part of a packet sent you as part of the official record of business transacted at the Senate's September 8 meeting. I thought it would be useful to contact you, bringing both these items to your attention.)

If you do not have a current Governmental Affairs Specialist, will you consider appointing, recruiting, or electing one? At the October 14 meeting of our Governmental Affairs Committee, we plan to reconstruct the network of campus governmental affairs specialists. It would be most helpful if you could fill in the bottom portion of this page and mail it back to me by October 11.
WHEREAS, The Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1988 (Proposition 78) will appear on the ballot of the November, 1988 general election; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 78 authorizes $600 million for specific capital improvement projects at the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges; and

WHEREAS, The CSU's share of the authorization for capital improvement projects in Proposition 78 is approximately $128 million for specific projects which have been reviewed and approved by the legislature and Governor; and

WHEREAS, Previous reductions in capital outlay and the rapid growth of enrollment in California public higher education and in CSU in particular have placed a very heavy and growing demand on classroom, laboratory, library, and other types of buildings; and

WHEREAS, The Tidelands Oil Fund, which has historically been the major source of revenue for capital expenditures for California public higher education, has been severely depleted because of the fall of oil prices during the last one and one-half years, thereby making bond financing more important; and

WHEREAS, The State of California's debt-service ratio for general obligation bonds of about 2% of the general fund is well below the national average of 4%; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse and support the Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1988 (Proposition 78); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge faculty and local campus senates to work for adoption of the Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1988 (Proposition 78).
OPPOSITION TO PROPOSITION 102 (DANNEMEYER)

WHEREAS, The AIDS reporting initiative sponsored by Representative William Dannemeyer, has qualified for the November, 1988 California ballot as Proposition 102; and

WHEREAS, The California State University has a direct interest in this proposition because of its impact on both our employees and students who as "students" and "teachers" are explicitly designated groups in the initiative; and

WHEREAS, The drastic fiscal impact of the initiative, were it to pass, would in the words of the July 17, 1988 editorial of the Los Angeles Times impose "a diversion of money from other more urgent needs identified by public-health officials in the areas of education and treatment." The required tracing of sexual partners "would cost millions, probably billions of dollars"; and

WHEREAS, The Gann limit would require that the cost of the proposition be shifted in some measure from education expenditures, the largest single pool of money over which the Legislature has discretionary control; and

WHEREAS, A basic finding of the Presidential Commission on the HIV Epidemic concluded that the success of current public-health strategies for fighting the spread of HIV infection are entirely dependent on voluntary cooperation and rigorous maintenance of confidentiality; and

WHEREAS, Major provisions of Prop. 102 relating to reporting of HIV test results would:

-- Require doctors, under criminal penalty, to report to local health officers the name of anyone "believed" to be infected with the virus which causes AIDS;

-- Order all persons who test HIV positive to report themselves for contact tracing and notification purposes;

-- Require HIV test results obtained during most research studies to be reported to health officers;
-- Make HIV test results available for insurance, employment, criminal and civil trials, school enrollment, and surveillance and contact notification purposes;

-- Create new penalties for certain crimes committed by law offenders infected with the virus, including assault; and

WHEREAS, Research has shown that many fewer people would be tested if anonymous testing were not available; and

WHEREAS, Prop. 102 is opposed by the California Medical Association, California Nurses' Association, California Association of Hospitals and Health Systems, Health Officers Association of California, League of California Cities, California Taxpayers' Association, League of Women Voters of California, California Teachers Association, Senators Pete Wilson and Alan Cranston, as well as Lieutenant Governor Leo McCarthy; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University oppose Proposition 102 and that it communicate its opposition and request the concurrence of the CSU Board of Trustees and the local campus senates.
Background statement: The Personnel Policies Committee recommends that faculty members, who apply (or are nominated) for a Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise (MPPP) Award and who do not receive one, should be notified. At present, the MPPP Awards procedures require only that recipients of the awards be notified.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND PROCEDURES FOR MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE AND PROFESSIONAL PROMISE AWARDS

WHEREAS, Applicants and nominees for Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise (MPPP) Awards should be informed as to the outcome of the MPPP Awards selection process; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Procedures for Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise (MPPP) Awards be amended as follows:

Section VI.A.

Recipients as well as the Personnel and Payroll Offices shall be notified, in writing, within five (5) days of concurrence. Applicants and nominees who did not receive awards shall be notified, in writing, after all awards allocated to the University have been granted. The dean's office of each school will send out the notifications after:

1. it receives the list of applicants and nominees who did not receive awards. This information will be provided by the Chair of the School MPPP Awards Committee;

2. it has been notified that all awards allocated to the University have been granted. This information will be provided by the Personnel Office.

Proposed By:
Personnel Policies Committee
October 11, 1988
PROCEDURES FOR
MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE AND PROFESSIONAL PROMISE AWARDS

I. PREAMBLE

This policy is designed to implement Articles 31.11 through 31.19 of the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three (faculty), agreed to in December, 1984.

Equal Opportunity guidelines govern the granting of MPPP Awards just as they do all other significant personnel actions at Cal Poly -- neither nominating faculty nor subsequent review bodies may discriminate on the basis of race, religion, or sex.

II. ELIGIBILITY

All persons covered by the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three are eligible to apply for or be nominated for Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards.

No MPPP Awards shall be made except under criteria mutually developed and approved by the campus President and the body of the Academic Senate.

No MPPP Awards shall be granted without a positive recommendation from the particular school or appropriate administrative unit MPPP Committee.

III. CRITERIA

Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards shall be given: (1) retrospectively, to recognize excellence in one or more of the following areas -- teaching, professional activity, service and/or (2) prospectively, to promote excellence in one or more of the same areas.

Individual schools may choose whether to develop more specific criteria statements appropriate to their disciplines as long as they do not contradict the general university statement. They are also free to determine whether variable criteria are appropriate for different ranks. If school committees elect to elaborate their own criteria, they are urged to remain consistent with established school criteria for other personnel decisions. School statements of criteria should be distributed to faculty and forwarded to the Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee well in advance of any selection cycle.

IV. APPLICATIONS/NOMINATIONS

Applications and nominations for MPPP Awards must document a candidate's excellent performance in teaching, professional activity, and/or service. Or

Applications and nominations for MPPP Awards must document proposed projects which would enhance a faculty member's performance in teaching, professional activity, and/or service. (Examples of some appropriate uses are travel, research support, technical/clerical support, released time, etc.) Or

Applications and nominations for MPPP Awards may combine the above.

V. SELECTION PROCESS

All members of Unit Three may submit applications or nominations to appropriate department heads by January 10. Past recipients are as eligible as all other unit members.
Every school or appropriate administrative unit shall elect a committee by January 15 to review applications/nominations for MPPP Awards. (Each department or other appropriate unit elects one representative from faculty who have neither applied for nor been nominated for an award.)

Department heads shall forward all applications/nominations to school committees by January 20. No rankings occur before nominations/applications reach school committees.

School committees will review nominations/applications without prejudice in favor of nominations as opposed to applications or vice versa, and by February 15, forward to the dean or appropriate administrator no more than the same number of applicants/nominees as MPPP Awards allocated to the school/appropriate administrative unit. Only positive recommendations shall be forwarded. School committees need to complete and return data sheets furnished by the Academic Senate before they disband.

If the dean or appropriate administrator concurs with the recommendations, the awards shall be granted as recommended no later than March 1.

If the dean/appropriate administrator disagrees with the recommendations forwarded by the faculty, both the recommendations of the dean or appropriate administrator and those of the faculty shall be forwarded to the President by March 1.

By March 5, the President shall transmit both sets of recommendations for review by the University Professional Leave Committee, which shall forward its positive recommendations by March 20 to the President for his/her consideration in making a final determination by April 1.

If the UPLC makes a negative determination, the committee shall state their reason and shall return the denied application to the originating school committee with the request to forward a substitute recommendation to the dean/appropriate administrator, repeating the original process. Each level of review shall complete and forward its recommendations within five (5) working days.

If the President disagrees with the UPLC, he/she shall state their reasons and shall return the denied application to the originating school committee with the request to forward a substitute recommendation to the dean/appropriate administrator, repeating the original process. Each level of review shall complete and forward its recommendations within five (5) working days.

This process shall be repeated until all the awards are granted or until the nominee/applicant pool is exhausted.

Awards shall be granted no later than June 30.

VI. GENERAL PROVISIONS

A. Recipients as well as the Personnel and Payroll Offices shall be notified in writing within five (5) days of concurrence.

B. Awards shall be paid within 30 days of having been granted.

C. When there is question as to the definition of the appropriate administrative unit for a particular application/nomination, said question shall be referred to the Personnel Policies Committee for resolution.

D. All other questions about procedures and dates should also be referred to the Personnel Policies Committee.
*E. Criteria remain broadly defined at the university level, but individual schools may opt to develop more specific criteria statements. (See III-Criteria)

*F. Past recipients of MPPP Awards are eligible for repeated awards.

*G. Part-time Unit Three employees are eligible for awards.

*H. No rankings occur before nominations/applications reach school committees.

*I. School committees need to complete and return data sheets furnished by the Academic Senate before they disband.

*J. Equal Opportunity guidelines govern the granting of MPPP Awards just as they do other significant personnel actions at Cal Poly.

* Approved by the Academic Senate 4/22/86
MEMORANDUM

To:    Charles Andrews, Chair
       Academic Senate

From:  Academic Senate Ad Hoc Review Committee:

Member      Department              School
-----      -------------------------  -----
Borland, Jim    Construction Mgt       SAED
Cooper, Alan    Biological Sciences    SSM
Ding, Day       Dean, SAED             Deans' Representative
Ferreira, Les    Dairy Science         SAGR
Irvin, Glenn    Interim Dean, SLA      Administration
Misic, Dragoslav Civ/Env Engr          SENG
Rice, Marilyn   Education              SPSE
Sharp, Harry (CH '89) Assoc Dean, SLA SLA
Snow, Marjorie  Academic Senate        Ex Officio
Stanton, George  Counseling & Testing  PCS
Stebbins, Mike (CH '38) Management    SBUS
West, Howard    President's Office     Administration

Subject: Report of the Academic Senate Ad Hoc Review Committee

During spring quarter 1988, the Academic Senate Ad Hoc Review Committee was formed
to evaluate faculty involvement in university committees. The Ad Hoc Review
Committee worked throughout the spring and summer quarters to assess needs and
recommend improvements in the governance system.

Our final report includes:
* An Executive Summary
* Assessment of Needs
* Goals and Philosophy
* Proposed Changes

The report reflects balanced attention to tasks (mission and purpose), structure
(organizational form, linkages, information flow, decision making), people (leadership,
expertise, interest, representation), and administrative support. Improvements in all
four areas have been addressed in an effort to strengthen Senate operations.

As a side point, we identified a major inadequacy: lack of a strategic planning process
and strategic plan for the campus. There has been progress in this direction, but much
more needs to be accomplished regarding strategy and long-term objectives.

In the course of our deliberations, we have met with over seventy faculty members and
administrators. We believe that our recommendations reflect their input and that our
proposals will help facilitate meaningful reorganization.

Attachment
MEMORANDUM

To: All Faculty

Date: November 1, 1988

Copies: W Baker  
J Landreth  
R Lucas  
B Rife  
H Scott  
D Walch  
M Wilson  
Academic Deans

From: Charles Andrews, Chair  
Academic Senate

Subject: Report of the Academic Senate Ad Hoc Review Committee  
On Academic Senate Reorganization

Attached find the report of the ad hoc committee that was appointed last year to review  
Academic Senate structure and recommend ways of making the Senate function more  
effectively as the voice of the faculty in formulating academic policy.

The committee, whose members included experienced faculty from each school,  
Professional Consultative Services, and appropriate members of the administration,  
finds that our current organization is less than optimal. It points to problems of  
communication within the Senate and between the Senate and administration.

The report and its recommendations reflect suggestions received orally and in writing  
from a wide variety of faculty. Preliminary drafts were reviewed by more than seventy  
individuals including current and past Senate committee chairs, past chairs, and  
statewide senators. Much of their advice has been incorporated into the present  
document. The proposals are far-reaching.

All faculty who take seriously their responsibilities as educational officers of the  
University are urged to read the whole report, not just the summary, to discuss its  
contents and share their reactions on the attached form, or by letter to the Senate  
office, no later than November 18, 1988. After that date, the report will be finalized  
and sent forward to the Academic Senate for adoption. We hope to have the essential  
recommendations of the report in effect by the beginning of the next academic year.

Questions may be directed to members of the ad hoc committee, whose names and phone  
numbers are listed on the report. The Senate will conduct an open forum on these  
proposals at a date/time to be announced. Members of the committee and other Senate  
and campus leaders will be present at this forum.

Attachments
We would like to obtain as complete and valid a representation as possible of university-wide reaction to the proposals in this report. We would appreciate your response even if you are indifferent to the recommendations made. For your convenience, a form has been prepared which may be used to give us your reaction. Alternatively, you may wish to write comments directly on the report and return it to us, jot down comments on a separate piece of paper, or verbally contact a member of the committee. Whichever form of response you use, and whatever your opinion, we would very much like a response from you so that we may accurately gauge the extent and nature of campus concern with the matters addressed in this report.

Date: ____________________

Response to the

Academic Senate Ad Hoc Review Committee Report

In general, I ___ approve ___ disapprove ___ am indifferent to the proposals in the enclosed report.

I have comments on the following proposed changes:

I. Academic Senate Executive Committee:
   A. Function
   B. Membership
   C. Other

II. The five proposed standing Academic Senate committees:

III. Other:

Name ____________________________
(Optional) Department ____________
(Optional)

PLEASE RETURN TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE (FOB 25H)
NO LATER THAN NOVEMBER 18, 1988
ACADEMIC SENATE AD HOC REVIEW COMMITTEE
REPORT

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Academic Senate Ad Hoc Review Committee has completed its diagnosis of Senate committee structure and process and offers a proposal for improving the existing governance system. The focal points for change include modification of the Senate Executive Committee, creation of five major "policy" committees of the Academic Senate with appropriate subcommittees, and linkage of University committees to these groups. The intent is to strengthen Senate operations through a committee restructuring and through goal-oriented leadership by the Senate Chair and Executive Committee.

Particular attention has been given to the Executive Committee. The report proposes a change in membership from representation by school caucus chairs to representation by major policy committee chairs. Five major policy committee chairs serve on the Executive Committee. The five committees are (1) Planning and Budget, (2) Educational Policies, (3) Research and Professional Development, (4) Student Relations, and (5) Faculty Affairs. These five committees oversee the work of several Senate subcommittees and provide liaison to related University-wide committees. New mission statements, membership representation and selection, and staff support requirements are outlined for each major policy committee.

The Executive Committee will continue to identify issues and proposals to be brought before the Senate for its consideration and set priorities for these matters. The Executive Committee will also continue to review all items prior to placement on the Senate agenda. In addition, the Executive Committee shall be responsible for establishing annual goals, objectives, and specific improvements for the Senate.

Finally, this report contains several recommendations regarding University-wide committees and Senate membership.

B. ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS

In keeping with the charge to the Ad Hoc Review Committee as outlined in the cover letter to this report, the Ad Hoc Review Committee examined diverse governance issues. Diagnostic activities included:

- Problem identification by committee members
- Interviews with President Baker, Charles Crabb, and other campus administrators and faculty
- Review of CAM and non-CAM committee documents
- Analysis of comprehensive governance studies completed at CSU San Diego and CSU Sonoma
- A dialogue with John Maguire, President of Claremont Center and Graduate School, concerning Claremont's committee reorganization
- Individual and group discussion sessions with over seventy faculty and administrators regarding the committee's initial recommendations (Interim Report)
The needs assessment resulted in the following themes:

1. **The governance system is unnecessarily complex**
   
   15 Academic Senate standing committees
   25 University-wide standing committees required by CAM
   15 University-wide non-CAM committees
   6 CSU or federally-required committees

   "Responsibilities are not always clear; the path to resolution of campus problems is long and rocky."

   "Why are so many groups working on similar issues?"

2. **The communication and information flow among interdependent Senate and University-wide committees has been problematic**

   "One example is planning and budget which involves several different bodies:
   University-wide: Instructional Program Resources Advisory Committee (IPRAC), President’s Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocations (PACBRA), and the Academic Planning Committee
   Academic Senate: Budget and Long-Range Planning Committees"

3. **Both faculty and administrators are disturbed about hours lost serving on ineffective committees. Demoralization leads to lack of interest in University-level service**

   "The committees are not set up for in-depth examination of issues; there is inadequate staff support from Administration; the chairs are overburdened."

   "Our committee developed a sound proposal only to see its intent completely changed on the Senate floor."

   "It’s compounded by the number of committee and advisement responsibilities at the school and department levels."

   "Many faculty don’t feel they have a voice in policy-making, and Administration does what it wants anyway."

4. **The University lacks a superstructure where missions, goals, strategies, and objectives are established for the campus**

   "Who sets the agenda for issues to be addressed over the next ten years?"

   "The changing environment demands a more responsive system."

5. **There exists a history of school, department, student senate, and faculty senate factionalism**
"We have a history of misunderstandings between the Senate and Administration. Many Senate resolutions sent to the President have been destined for failure."

6. Some Senate committees seldom meet and fail to maintain minimal contacts with the Senate office

"The Senate office and Executive Committee need to be in better touch with committees and the issues being addressed."

"The Senate meets too often, allowing committee work to be done on the Senate floor."

"The Senate gets sidetracked with trivial issues."

C. GOALS AND PHILOSOPHY

The Ad Hoc Review Committee believes that greater partnership is needed among Administration, faculty, and students to effectively deal with the University's changing environment. The proposals set forth in Section D of this report are based on the following goals:

1. To help the campus stay goal-oriented by providing efficient structure and processes to address important outside environment and internal issues.

2. To provide a clear path for review and discussion of issues related to the University.

3. To provide a representative steering body comprised of student, administrative, and faculty leaders to set the agenda for University-wide planning and problem solving.

4. To facilitate active consultation between faculty and Administration at all Senate committee levels (rather than separate and fragmented work).

5. To simplify Senate organization by creating a limited number of standing committees.

6. To make widespread use of temporary teams or working groups to study and resolve specific problems.

7. To strike a balance between interest, expertise, and representation when committee staffing decisions are made for Senate and University-wide committees.

8. To provide close working relationships among executive bodies and the various (policy and ad hoc) committees.

9. To provide opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to utilize and develop talents, skills, and abilities.

10. To foster a climate of involvement in which committee work and University service leads to meaningful change.
D. PROPOSED CHANGES

ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Ad Hoc Review Committee recommends a new Executive Committee concept. Its mission, membership, and functions are as follows:

Charge:
To provide leadership and direction for Academic Senate activities by identifying major policy issues and opportunities; to serve as a sounding board for faculty, administrators, and students; and to coordinate the efforts of standing Senate committees and ad hoc working groups. Executive Committee meetings are open to all faculty, staff, and students and it is the central point of contact for those who wish to place topics on the Senate agenda. Its role is to prepare the agenda and pass on completed committee work rather than approve or edit the work.

Key Functions:

New Functions:
- Propose and ratify the Senate Chair's charges to standing and ad hoc committees.
- Establish annual Senate goals and plan a year-long agenda.
- Establish strategy and order of agenda items for each Senate meeting.
- Provide strong linkage to standing committees and oversee committee progress.
- Hold meetings of the Executive Committee devoted to issues of concern to students, administrators, and faculty.

Existing Functions:
- Approve caucus recommendations for appointment of committee members to existing committee vacancies.
- Direct studies to committees and receipt of reports therefrom for inclusion on the agenda.
- Fill temporary vacancies in the membership of the Senate.
- Make nominations for a temporary vacancy for CSU senator.
- Fill temporary vacancies in Senate office or membership of the Executive Committee except in the case of vacancies created by recall.
- Approve nominations and/or appointments by the Academic Senate Chair to other official committees.
- Appoint a representative of the temporary academic employees to serve as senator for the academic year.

Membership:
Elected Senate Officers (Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary) 3
Chairs of standing major policy committees (Planning and Budget, Educational Policies, Research and Professional Development, Student Relations, and Faculty Affairs) 5
Deans' representative (includes Dean of Library Services) (rotates annually) 1
Vice President for Academic Affairs 1
Dean of Student Affairs 1
Statewide senator 1
(omits two statewide senators, past Academic Senate Chair, and school caucus chairs)
Rationale for Changes:
+ Provides strong linkages to major policy committees
+ Makes it easier to assign issues and monitor progress on important topics
+ Draws key administrators into the problem solving process
+ Promotes a University-wide perspective

- Drawback: loss of school perspective unless committee chairs are selected with school representation in mind

ACADEMIC SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

The Ad Hoc Review Committee recommends that the number of standing committees in the Academic Senate be reduced by consolidation and, where appropriate, subcommittees added. Standing committee chairs would be appointed by the Chair of the Senate, in consultation with the committee and subject to ratification by the Senate as a whole. They would be appointed for two-year terms (half one year, half the next) and would also serve as ex officio, nonvoting members of the Senate unless they had otherwise been elected to the Senate itself.

Committee chairs would **not** be representatives of their school to their committees. As is currently the case, each school caucus would appoint a member to each standing committee with the Executive Committee making the final approvals. Committee chairs will not necessarily be appointed from the membership of the committee. However, if the chair is an existing member of the committee, a replacement will be made to fill the vacancy created in that school.

**1) Planning and Budget Committee**

Proposed Change:
Combines policy functions of existing Long-Range Planning and Budget Committees and assumes that some specific detail tasks currently performed by them, particularly Budget, would be delegated to subcommittees, task groups, etc.

Present Responsibilities:
The existing Budget Committee reviews matters related to the allocation of budget resources and provides input to the instructional budgetary process. It also monitors budget allocations and expenditures made departmentally and by school. The existing Long-Range Planning Committee makes recommendations concerning future actions, policies, and goals as they affect the University.

Charge:
Develop policies to implement the University's mission and strategic plans. Develop budgeting policies based on those plans. Annually review major budgetary decisions for consistency with existing University plans and educational policies. Recommend to the Senate Chair names of faculty for service on University task forces and committees.

Membership:
Committee chair, appointed by the Academic Senate Chair
One representative from each school/PCS selected by their school caucus
Deans' representative (includes Dean of Library Services)
Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee (ex officio, voting)
Vice President for Business Affairs (ex officio, voting)
ASI representative (ex officio, voting)
Budget officer (ex officio, nonvoting)
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (ex officio, nonvoting)
Assigned Time:
Assigned time for committee chair

Executive Committee Membership:
Chair sits on the Executive Committee (ex officio, voting)

Staff Support:
Provided by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Office, and the Business Affairs Office.

Rationale:
To provide a more integrated approach to matters of University planning and budgetary policies. Historically, planning at Cal Poly has been a function assigned to a variety of committees (Academic Planning, Senate Long-Range Planning, etc.) and individuals (deans, vice presidents, key staff). Likewise, budget decisions have been divided among various groups (Senate Budget Committee, PACBRA, IPRAC).
While there is enough detail work to keep them all busy, no one body is providing overall policy direction or advice to the Senate. Often, we believe, policy planning committees have been inadequately informed on the financial implications of their proposals. Meanwhile, the Senate Budget Committee—one of our most important and effective—has focused on year-to-year allocations, dealing with emergency cutbacks and the like. Consequently, their expertise has not effectively influenced major long-range policy planning. We propose a Planning and Budget Committee that can assess planning and budget needs concurrently.

Drawback: heavy committee workload.

**2) Educational Policies Committee**

Proposed Change:
Subsumes policy responsibilities and major decision recommendations of existing committees: Curriculum, General Education and Breadth, and Library. Uses subcommittees for detail work on these matters.

Present Responsibilities:
The existing Curriculum Committee is responsible for recommendations regarding academic master planning and curriculum. The General Education and Breadth (GE&B) Committee provides oversight, direction, and evaluation of the general education component of the university curriculum and recommends appropriate requirements, policies, and procedures. The committee also reviews all courses proposed for GE&B certification. The Library committee acts as a fact-finding body on matters dealing with library affairs and policy.

Charge:
Examines (and may generate) proposals of broad educational significance such as general degree requirements. Examines in-depth proposals for important changes in the academic programs of the University (e.g., new majors, new masters degree programs, perhaps new concentrations, elimination of existing programs, significant changes in structure of the General Education and Breadth program, etc.). Provides policy guidance and oversight for subcommittees that do the detail work on curricular and library issues.
Membership:
Committee chair, appointed by the Academic Senate Chair
One representative from each school/PCS selected by their school caucus
Vice President for Academic Affairs (ex officio, voting)
ASI representative (ex officio, voting)
Chairs of the GE&B Subcommittee, Curriculum Review Subcommittee, and the Library and Information Systems Subcommittee (ex officio, voting)

Assigned Time:
Assigned time for committee chair

Executive Committee Membership:
Chair sits on the Executive Committee (ex officio, voting)

Staff Support:
Provided by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Office

Rationale:
The objective in creating this committee and assigning it a broad charge is to identify a single body whose focus is the whole of educational policy development. The current system fragments that responsibility assigning part of it to Curriculum, part to General Education, part to Library, part to computing advisory bodies. No Senate body looks at the whole. The sort of detailed examination of specific details (i.e., does XYZ meet the specific guidelines for GE&B area B.2.a?) will be assigned to subcommittees. The Educational Policies Committee is to focus on such issues as what programs should be added or deleted, etc. The proposed committee will be able to coordinate all curriculum and related matters.

Subcommittee Structure:

Curricular Review Subcommittee
Membership:
   Subcommittee chair, appointed by the Academic Senate Chair
   One representative from each school/PCS selected by their school caucus
   ASI representative
   Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (ex officio, voting)
Charge:
   Conducts review of specific changes recommended in courses, lists of classes in majors, etc. Approves or disapproves same for the Senate. Refers to Educational Policies only controversial matters that cannot be resolved. Note proposals for new degrees, majors, etc., are reviewed by Educational Policies and the full Senate.
Staff Support:
   Provided by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Office

General Education and Breadth Subcommittee
Membership:
   Subcommittee chair, appointed by the Academic Senate Chair
   One representative from each school/PCS selected by their school caucus
   ASI representative
   Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (ex officio, voting)
Charge:
Essentially the same as the current GE&B Committee. The bylaws presently read as follows: (1.7.b. Responsibilities - The General Education and Breadth Committee shall provide oversight, direction, and evaluation of the general education component of the university curriculum on a continuing basis, and shall recommend appropriate requirements, policies, and procedures. The committee will review all courses proposed for general education and breadth certification in various distribution areas, will periodically review the appropriateness of certified courses, and will review the mix of courses in the distribution areas... Implementation... shall conform with the curriculum review process...)

Staff Support:
Provided by Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Office

Library and Information Systems
Membership:
Subcommittee chair, appointed by the Academic Senate Chair
One representative from each school/PCS selected by their school caucus
ASI representative
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (ex officio, voting)
Vice President for Information Systems (ex officio, voting)
Dean of Library Services (ex officio, voting)

Charge:
Examine implications of developments in relevant technology and practices in information systems as they may impact the educational mission of the University and recommend appropriate modifications in educational policies.

(3) Research and Professional Development Committee

Proposed Change:
Combines Research and University Professional Leave Committees

Charge:
The same as present responsibilities plus promotion of faculty development activities.

Present Responsibilities:
The existing Research Committee (1) develops appropriate policies and guidelines for the encouragement and conduct of research, (2) evaluates research proposals for Creative Activity and Research Effort (CARE) grants, and (3) evaluates request for special leaves for research or creative activity and, when appropriate, assigns them a rank order for consideration. (See Bylaws for full text.)

The existing University Professional Leave Committee (1) recommends changes in the procedures and criteria for ranking leave with pay applications, (2) recommends change in leave with pay application response deadlines, (3) reviews school/library leave with pay procedures and criteria for compliance with MOU and university guidelines, (4) reviews all applications and the prioritization by school/library professional leave committees to ensure compliance with approved guidelines and quality of applications, (5) makes ad hoc recommendations concerning the filling of such unused sabbatical leave vacancies which occur after the initial awarding. (See Bylaws for full text.)
Membership:
Committee chair, appointed by the Academic Senate chair
One representative from each school/PCS selected by their school caucus
Deans' representative (includes Dean of Library Services)
Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development (ex officio, voting)

Assigned Time:
Assigned time for committee chair

Executive Committee Membership:
Chair sits on the Executive Committee (ex officio, voting)

Staff Support:
Provided by Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development Office

Rationale:
Consolidates the related responsibilities of the Research and University Professional Leave Committees and streamlines these procedures.

(4) Student Relations Committee

Proposed Change:
Combines Instruction and Student Affairs Committees

Charge:
The same as present responsibilities with the exception of advising on admission quotas.

Present Responsibilities:
The existing Instruction Committee is responsible for recommendations regarding subjects which impinge directly on the quality of teaching. The Student Affairs Committee is responsible for recommendations concerning the interrelationship of the student and academic environment. And, it is the advisory body of the Academic Senate on admission policies and quotas.

Membership:
Committee chair, appointed by the Academic Senate Chair
One representative from each school/PCS selected by their school caucus
Director of Audiovisual Services (ex officio, voting)
Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee (ex officio, voting)
Dean of Student Affairs or designee (ex officio, voting)
Two ASI representatives (ex officio, voting)

Assigned Time:
Assigned time for committee chair

Executive Committee Membership:
Chair sits on the Executive Committee (ex officio, voting)

Staff Support:
Provided by the Dean of Student Affairs Office

Rationale:
Combines the responsibilities of two committees which both focus on students and the academic environment.
(5) Faculty Affairs Committee

Proposed Change:
Renames the Personnel Policies Committee and adds the Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee as a subcommittee.

Charge:
The same as present responsibilities. In addition, the Faculty Affairs Committee shall act as the committee to review Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards referred to it by the President.

Present Responsibilities:
The existing Personnel Policies Committee is the advisory body of the Academic Senate on personnel policy and its administration and procedures. The scope of personnel procedures and policies coming within its purview include appointment, tenure, academic freedom, leave of absence, retention, professional relations and ethics, promotion, research, grievance, layoff procedures, and lecturers' rights and responsibilities. The Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee determines the criteria to be used for judging distinguished teachers and makes the final selection of three distinguished teachers annually.

Membership:
Committee chair, appointed by the Academic Senate Chair
Chair of the Distinguished Teaching Awards Subcommittee
One representative from each school/PCS selected by their school caucus
Director of Personnel Relations or designee (ex officio, voting)
ASI representative (ex officio, voting)

Assigned Time:
Assigned time for committee chair

Executive Committee Membership:
Chair sits on the Executive Committee (ex officio, voting)

Staff Support:
Provided by the Personnel Office

Rationale:
Combines two committees which both focus on faculty concerns (e.g., personnel matters and the quality of teaching).

(6) Senate Affairs Committee

Proposed Change:
Combines Constitution & Bylaws and Elections Committees. No change in the committees' charges.

Present Responsibilities:
The Constitution & Bylaws Committee periodically reviews the Constitution of the Faculty and the Bylaws of the Academic Senate. Changes are recommended to keep operating procedures current and in agreement with university regulations and the memorandum of understanding of the faculty. The Elections Committee is responsible for supervising and conducting the election process for membership to the Academic Senate, Senate officers, statewide senators ... and ad hoc search committees...
Membership:
Committee chair, appointed by the Academic Senate Chair
One representative from each school/PCS selected by their school caucus

No assigned time for the chair.

No representation on the Executive Committee.

(7) Fairness Board

No proposed changes.

Present Responsibilities:
The Fairness Board is the primary campus group concerned with providing "due process" of academically related matters for the students and instructors at Cal Poly. The Board hears grade appeals based on the grievant's belief that the instructor has made a mistake, shown bad faith or incompetence, or been unfair. The responsibilities of the Academic Senate Fairness Board are set forth in full in a document entitled "FAIRNESS BOARD Description and Procedures" (CAM Appendix XI).

Membership:
Committee chair, appointed by the Academic Senate Chair
One representative from each school/PCS selected by their school caucus
One member from Student Services (appointed by the Academic Senate Chair for a two-year term)
At least two ASI representatives who have at least junior standing and have attended Cal Poly for at least three consecutive quarters

No assigned time for the chair.

No representation on the Executive Committee.

Status of Women Committee

It is proposed that the Status of Women Committee become a university-wide committee, reporting to the President. (See proposal under UNIVERSITY-WIDE COMMITTEE STRUCTURE.)

UNIVERSITY-WIDE COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

We propose to "fine tune" the existing system with the following recommendations:

- Elimination of the "rule" that requires Academic Senate appointments to certain university-wide committees; e.g., Energy Conservation, Bookstore Advisory, Facilities Use, Foundation Food Service, and the Student Affairs Council.

- Elimination of Academic Senate representation on university-wide committees if the committee has faculty representation.

- Appoint the chair of the Student Relations Committee to the Student Affairs Council as the only faculty representative.
Nominations of faculty to university-wide committees should be made in consultation with the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

Faculty representatives on each university-wide committee will elect an individual to serve as liaison with the Senate office/Chair.

Add the Status of Women Committee to the list of university-wide bodies, and broaden it to include staff and student membership.

**SENATE STRUCTURE AND PROCESSES**

Membership:
The composition of Senate membership (elected faculty, two students, and named administrators—President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Student Affairs, deans’ representative) remains the same with the possible exception that:

1. The part-time faculty representative be given voting status and be appointed annually instead of quarterly.

2. The committee chairs (5) become ex officio, nonvoting senators since they will be on the Executive Committee. (They cannot be given voting membership on the Senate, however, since voting senators must be elected by each school/PCS and the number of senators per school/PCS is determined by formula.)

Presently, faculty interested in being senators must submit a written form indicating their desire to serve. It is proposed that this be changed so that each academic department would be responsible for forwarding the name of at least one nominee (departments with fewer than 10 faculty may submit a nominee but are not required to do so) to be placed on the school election ballot.

Rationale:
Promotes full representation and linkages to most departments.