CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

ACADEMIC SENATE

Academic Senate Agenda
Tuesday, January 10, 1989
3:00-5:00 p.m.
UU 220

I. Minutes:
   Approval of the November 15, 1988 Minutes of the Academic Senate (pp. 2-4).

II. Communication(s):
   A. Reading Materials (p. 5)
   B. Memo from Naples to Andrews re Merit Salary Adjustments (p. 6)
   C. Memos from Baker to Kerschner re Campus-Based, Study-Abroad Programs (pp. 7-9).

   Resolution(s) approved by President Baker:
   AS-300-88/PPC Resolution to Amend Procedures for MPPP Awards
   AS-301-88/PCS Resolution to Restore MSA's for Nonfaculty Employees
   AS-302-88/Weatherby Resolution re Campus-Based Study Abroad Programs

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

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
   A. Resolution to Amend the Bylaws Making the Research Committee an Elected Committee-Rogalla, Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, Second Reading (pp. 10-13).
   B. Resolution to Provide a Generic Set of Operating Procedures for Academic Senate Standing and Ad Hoc Committees-Rogalla, Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, First Reading (pp. 14-16).
   C. Resolution on Promotion of Librarians-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, First Reading (pp. 17-21).
   D. Resolution on Tenure for Librarians-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, First Reading (pp. 22-24).
   E. Resolution in Support of Human Corps and of Service/Learning at Cal Poly-Lutrin, Chair of the Human Corps Task Force, First Reading (pp. 25-27).
   F. Resolution on Minor Capital Outlay-Rogers, Chair of the Budget Committee, First Reading (pp. 28-29).
   G. Resolution on the Curriculum Review Process-Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, First Reading (pp. 30-31).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment: time certain 4:55pm

ALSO ENCLOSED IS CAL POLY COMMUNITY SERVICE'S BROCHURE ENTITLED CATCH IT! IT'S CATCHING ON!
(New reading materials highlighted in bold)

11/15/88  "A Quarter Century of Graduates" (CSU)

11/17/88  "Unfinished Business" (Achievement Council) - information re the large achievement gap that has separated minority and low-income students from other young Californians.

11/22/88  Status Report, Faculty Software Library Lottery Funds (Cal Poly)


12/7/88  "Statement on Competencies in Languages Other Than English Expected of Entering Freshmen: Phase I-French, German, Spanish (CSU Academic Senate)
Memorandum

To: Charles T. Andrews  
Chair, Academic Senate  
California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo

From: Caesar J. Nibbles  
Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations

Subject: Merit Salary Adjustments

I have read your memorandum of November 18, 1988 and appreciate learning of the Senate's efforts concerning Merit Salary Adjustments for support staff employees.

You may be assured that Chancellor Reynolds has designated restoration of MSA funding a high budget priority and has instructed staff to work diligently in Sacramento to achieve that goal.

CJN:db

cc: Dr. W. Ann Reynolds  
President Warren J. Baker
Cal Poly has been closely involved with both the development of campus-based, study-abroad programs and with the deliberations which led to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on International Education. Accordingly, the proposed new Executive Order and Implementing Guidelines are a topic of major interest and some concern on this campus.

On Tuesday, November 15, our campus Academic Senate endorsed the statewide Academic Senate's resolutions on the Executive Order and Guidelines. In brief, the faculty vote expresses the view that at a time when student opportunities for study abroad should be expanding, guidelines should not be established including provisions which overly restrict or remove those opportunities.

While there is a need for policy definition and procedural guidance, we believe the proposed Executive Order and Guidelines are based on unnecessarily narrow and restrictive interpretations.

With regard to the Executive Order, I want to emphasize my concerns with Items 4-e and 6:

Item 4-e requires Chancellor's Office approval for each iteration of the program. While I recognize the need to monitor programs, it would seem that once a program has gone through the review process and has been approved, additional summary review and additional approval should only be required when a different intent and/or content occurs in the program.

Item 6 delegates authority for the approval of all programs to the Director of International Programs. The approval level in the Executive Order should be the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

While the Guidelines include seventy procedural statements, our major concerns are limited to two items:

Item 13. Annual approval from the Chancellor's Office is inappropriate and inconsistent with the idea of long-term planning expressed in Item 9. (See my comments below)
Item 29. This would prohibit the faculty supervisors of student groups from accepting free or reduced rate travel. This section which calls attention to the potential subsidization or avoidance of legitimate state expenses which might offset student transportation costs, is well intended. However, guidelines should not be so overly restrictive that they would prevent the campuses from pursuing the most cost efficient mechanisms and ones which may be the normal business practice. To decline, or not be able, to participate in the normal business practices of the travel industry may not result in discounted student travel costs.

In sum, the specific objectives are few, but of importance to the existence of the kind of campus-based programs we support. A more general reservation regarding the guidelines is that they are overly long, with the potential to discourage all but the most intrepid from proposing programs.

Since the intent of both the Chancellor's Office and the campuses is to encourage all types of academically sound study-abroad programs, it is timely and important to establish reasonable policies and procedures which provide the Chancellor's Office appropriate oversight while providing campuses the freedom and flexibility needed to encourage program development. To that end, the proposed Executive Order and Guidelines provide a good beginning, but the fundamental changes as indicated above should be considered.
Memorandum

To: Lee R. Kerschner
   Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
   The California State University
   Office of the Chancellor
   400 Golden Shore
   Long Beach, CA 90802-4275

From: Warren J. Baker
   President

Subject: STUDY-ABROAD PROGRAMS

Date: December 5, 1988

As a follow-up to my recent memo in which I provided our comments regarding the Proposed Executive Order and Guidelines for Campus-based Study-Abroad Programs, there is one additional concern which needs to be addressed. Item 14 of the guidelines provides that all costs for materials, facilities and services must be paid with State funds. If this guideline is a rigid statement of policy, it will greatly diminish the opportunity for, if not totally eliminate, campus-based study-abroad programs. I recognize that the issue of "veiled tuition" which is being addressed by this guideline, is of concern. However, our perspective is that without some mechanism to address some portion of the costs, there is doubt about the ability of campuses to mount study-abroad programs totally within the State General Fund budget.

While the language in Executive Order 362 dealing with miscellaneous course fees and the need for them being optional would seem to provide the umbrella necessary for some fee structure, I recognize that Executive Order 362 was not developed with study-abroad programs in mind.

If Executive Order 362 is not the appropriate vehicle, then perhaps the issue could be addressed, either in a revision of Executive Order 362, or in the proposed new Executive Order. If what now appears to be a rigid prohibition of any fee for facilities and services is not revised, it will create very serious problems for campus-based study-abroad programs; and I urge that consideration be given to this issue.
MEMORANDUM

To:        John Rogalla, Chair  
Constitution and Bylaws Committee

From:     Charles T. Andrews, Chair  
Academic Senate

Subject:  Constitution and Bylaws Committee Resolutions

Date:       November 4, 1988

The Constitution and Bylaws Committee resolution to provide a generic set of operating procedures for Academic Senate committees has been continued to the next Executive Committee meeting on November 29, 1988. Your attendance at this meeting is requested in order to respond to questions raised by the Executive Committee.

The Resolution to Make the Research Committee an Elected Committee will be brought before the Senate next Tuesday, November 15. Your attendance at this meeting will also be necessary.

The following concerns were voiced at the Executive Committee meeting regarding the Research Committee resolution:

1. There is no statement indicating the length of term for elected Research Committee members after the first election.

2. If no nominations for committee membership are submitted from a particular school during the election period, does that vacancy become subject to the same bylaws rule which governs UPLC (i.e., that a one-year appointment can be made by the school caucus to fill the vacancy)?

3. Re section 1.12.c: If this section becomes obsolete, what will regulate future staggering of terms?

These questions will probably be raised on the Senate floor at the November 15 meeting.

Thank you, John, for your timely submittal of these resolutions. Please call me if you have any questions regarding the above.
Adopted: ______________

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

Background statement:

The June 14, 1988 directive from the Chancellor's Office specifies that the faculty committee which evaluates State Funded Faculty Support Grants must be elected by the faculty. This provision was negotiated with CFA. The directive did not specify that elected faculty only should serve on the committee; however, the resolution is drafted to make it an elected faculty committee. The Research Committee has the expertise and has expressed a desire to be the committee to evaluate these proposals. This will require changing the membership of the Research Committee from appointive to elected positions.

Several concerns were expressed as this request was being discussed. They are reported here as an aid to Senate deliberation. This will create a powerful committee which evaluates all competitive grants on this campus; the operating procedures should provide assurance that evaluation of different grants will be accomplished using distinct sets of criteria to assure that all types of proposals will have a chance for acceptance. The present practice of committee members abstaining from competition for grants during their tenure on the committee should be codified in the operating procedures as well.

An election is requested for this committee early in 1989 in order for operating procedures and criteria for evaluating State Funded Faculty Support Grants to be developed by the start of Spring Quarter. This will allow award winners a full year for completing their grants. Regular election would put off awards until the Fall Quarter and grantees would have but six months to complete these school-year grants.

The Constitution and Bylaws Committee deliberated on this proposal October 4 and October 11. The recommendation was passed with five positive and one negative vote. (Members from the School of Architecture/Environmental Design and the School of Science and Mathematics, as well as the student representative seats were vacant.)

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS
MAKING THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE AN ELECTED COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, The committee evaluating State Funded Faculty Support Grants must be elected; and
RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS
MAKING THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE AN ELECTED COMMITTEE

AS—____-88/____
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WHEREAS, The Elections Committee has the expertise to perform this service; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be amended as follows:

VII.I.5.a.b. Responsibilities

The Elections Committee shall be responsible for supervising and conducting the election process for membership to the Academic Senate, Research Committee, University Professional Leave Committee, Senate offices, the statewide Academic Senate, appropriate recall elections for the preceding as per Section VIII of these Bylaws, and ad hoc committees created to search for such university positions as president, vice presidents, and school deans, etc.

(2) Election of Academic Senate members, Research Committee and Professional Leave Committee.

(a) At the March meeting of the Senate, the committee shall announce impending vacancies in the Senate membership (according to the filled full-time equivalent faculty positions as of the first week of February, as listed by the university Personnel office), in the Research Committee, and in the University Professional Leave Committee. At the same time, each caucus shall be notified in writing of its vacancies.

I.12.a. Membership

Members of the Research Committee shall be elected by the faculty.

b. Responsibilities

(3) Evaluate requests for State Funded Faculty Support Grants and make recommendations for funding when appropriate to the President through the Academic Senate. Ex officio members shall be nonvoting for these deliberations.

(4) Evaluate.

c. This section becomes obsolete and will be stricken from these Bylaws June 30, 1989.

(1) Election for the Research Committee shall be held early in Winter Quarter 1989.

(2) Members elected from the Schools of Agriculture, Architecture and Environmental Design, Business, and Engineering shall serve two-year terms. Members elected from the Schools of Liberal Arts, Professional Studies and Education, Science and Mathematics, and the
RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS
MAKING THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE AN ELECTED COMMITTEE
AS—___-88/_____

Page Three

representative from Professional Consultative Services shall serve one-year terms.

(3) The committee shall develop detailed operating procedures and criteria for evaluating State Funded Faculty Support Grants to be approved by the Senate before March 17, 1989.

(4) The committee shall develop criteria for evaluating Care grant proposals in the 1989–1990 school year to be approved by the Senate before June 8, 1989.

Proposed By:
Constitution and Bylaws Committee
November 1, 1988
MEMORANDUM

To: John Rogalla, Chair
    Constitution and Bylaws Committee

From: Charles T. Andrews, Chair
    Academic Senate

Subject: Resolution to Provide Generic Set of Operating Procedures for Academic Senate Standing and Ad Hoc Committees

Date: December 16, 1988

At the Academic Senate Executive Committee meeting of November 29, the following comments were expressed concerning the above-entitled resolution.

On page two, under Operating Procedures, the nature of the comments made for each item are as follows:

1. Should chairpersons be elected by the majority vote of the attending members if a quorum is not present?

2. Possible revision of this item to read, "Meetings shall be called at the discretion of the chairperson or upon the request of three members of the committee."

Possible additions:

Committees may also establish a regular meeting time

Upon committee agreement, if a regular meeting time is established, this constitutes notice

Committees are required to meet at least once per quarter

3. Add to the end of this paragraph, "statements waiving the notice requirement or regular meeting time."

5. Add wording to indicate that simultaneous communication does not refer to telephone communication.

7. Should a vote by the majority of the members attending be the decision of the committee if a quorum is not present?

Two general comments were made concerning a committee's authority to change their own Operating Procedures:

If a committee wants to change their procedures, does the full Senate have to approve those changes?

Could the committee's procedures be changed every year with each new membership?

Please discuss these suggestions with your committee and bring any proposed changes to the resolution, in writing, to the January 10, 1989 Senate meeting. Thank you.
Background statement: The Academic Senate bylaws specify that each committee shall have written operating procedures on file in the office of the Academic Senate. These are to be reviewed by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is proposing this set of generic operating procedures to assist committees in meeting this requirement. It could be accepted as a blanket procedure unless a committee prefers to draft its own. This draft was accepted unanimously by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee in January 1988 and affirmed by a vote of 6-0 on October 11, 1988. Vacant membership on the committee included SAED, SSM, and ASI.

AS-____-88/____

RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE A GENERIC SET OF OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC SENATE STANDING AND AD HOC COMMITTEES

WHEREAS, Article VII Section D of the Academic Senate bylaws specify each committee shall have a written set of operating procedures on file in the Senate office; and

WHEREAS, A generic set of procedures will be acceptable to many committees; and

WHEREAS, Any committee requiring greater detail and specificity in operation can propose and have them accepted; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the generic operating procedures for Academic Senate committees (attached) be accepted.

Proposed By:
Constitution and Bylaws Committee
November 1, 1988
OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES

The committees of the Academic Senate, both standing and ad hoc, shall comply with the below listed operating procedures unless the Constitution or Bylaws of the Academic Senate provide otherwise or unless a committee desires to propose specific procedures for that committee.

1. Chairpersons shall be elected by the majority vote of the attending members at the first meeting of the academic year called by the Chair of the Senate. Chairpersons serve until the end of the academic year. In the event that a chairperson must miss a meeting, the chairperson shall appoint a substitute chairperson for that meeting.

2. Meetings shall be called at the discretion of the chairperson except that the chairperson must call a meeting upon the request of three members of the committee.

3. Notice of a meeting must be sent by the chairperson no less than three (3) working days before the meeting date. Nonetheless, decisions made at meetings may not be challenged for lack of proper notice if all members either show up for the meeting or sign written statements waiving the notice requirement.

4. A majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum for a meeting.

5. Decisions of the committee must be made at meetings in which the attending members are in simultaneous communication with each other.

6. Members may not vote by proxy.

7. A vote by the majority of the members attending a meeting shall be the decision of the committee.

8. Voting shall take place by a show of hands unless one attending member requests a secret ballot. The record shall show the resulting vote.

9. A committee report explaining the decision and noting the vote leading to the decision of the committee shall be filed at the Academic Senate office. Minority reports also may be filed with that office.
WHEREAS, Librarians are members of the Unit 3 bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, The CSU-CFA Unit 3 contract specifically mentions librarians in appropriate sections; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That CAM 342 be amended as indicated on the attached sheets.
342.2 ACADEMIC PROMOTIONS

A. Eligibility

Promotion eligibility shall be governed by the terms of Article 14 of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the CSU and Unit 3 Faculty. In particular, tenure is required for promotion to professor or librarian. In addition, persons (other than department heads/chairs) whose primary duties are administrative shall not normally be advanced in academic rank without the concurrence of the tenured faculty of higher rank from the appropriate department.

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

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

2. Applicants for promotion shall submit a resume which indicates evidence of promotability. This resume shall include all categories pertinent to promotion consideration: teaching activities and performance, or librarian effectiveness and performance, professional growth and achievement, service to the university and community, and any other activities which indicate professional commitment, service, or contribution to the discipline, department, school, university, or community.

In preparing resumes, applicants are encouraged to employ the Faculty Resume Worksheet (CAM Appendix XII) as a guide.

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

4. Promotion in rank is not automatic and is granted only in recognition of teaching competency or effectiveness as a librarian, professional performance, and meritorious service during the period in rank. The application of criteria will be more rigorous for promotion to professor or librarian than to associate professor or associate librarian.

Recommendations for promotion of individuals are based on the exhibition of merit and ability in each of the following four factors and their subordinate sub-factors:

a. Teaching Performance or effectiveness as a librarian and/or Other Professional Performance

Consideration is to be given to such factors as the faculty member's competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of courses, relevance of instruction to
course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student consultation, and other factors relating to performance as a teacher.

In formulating recommendations on the promotion of teaching faculty, evaluators will place primary emphasis on success in instruction. The results of the Student Evaluation of Faculty program are to be considered in formulating recommendations based on teaching performance.

For librarians, consideration is to be given to such factors as performance effectiveness in terms of quantity and quality: fulfilling responsibilities; furthering the objectives of the library and the university by cooperating with fellow librarians; considering and initiating new ideas, technologies, or procedures; applying bibliographic techniques effectively to the acquisition, development, classification, and organization of library resources; initiating and carrying to conclusion projects within the library; demonstrating versatility, including the ability to work effectively in a range of library functions and subject areas.

In formulating recommendations on the promotion of librarians, evaluators will place primary emphasis on effectiveness as a librarian as evaluated by colleagues and library users.

b. Professional Growth and Achievement

Consideration is to be given to the faculty member's original preparation and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies, and publications, and presentation of papers at professional and scholarly meetings.

c. Service to University and Community

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

d. Other Factors of Consideration

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

For librarians, additional factors of consideration include leadership and/or supervision and/or administrative abilities.
5. Possession of the doctorate or other designated terminal degree from an accredited institution is normally required for promotion.

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

7. Normal Promotion

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

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

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

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

8. Early Promotion

a. An application for promotion to associate professor or associate librarian is considered "early" if the applicant is eligible and one (or both) of the following is (are) true:

(i) the applicant is a probationary faculty member who is not also applying for tenure.

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

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

c. Early promotion will be granted only in exceptional cases. The circumstances and record of performance which make the case
exceptional shall be fully documented by the candidate and validated by evaluators. The fact that an applicant meets the performance criteria for promotion does not in itself constitute an exceptional case for early promotion.
WHEREAS, Librarians are members of the Unit 3 bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, The CSU-CFA Unit 3 contract specifically mentions librarians in appropriate sections; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That CAM 344 be amended as indicated on the attached sheets.

Proposed By: Personnel Policies Committee
November 29, 1988
TENURE FOR ACADEMIC EMPLOYEES

A. Eligibility

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

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

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

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

3. Applicants for tenure shall submit a resume which indicates evidence supporting the award of tenure. This resume shall include all categories pertinent to tenure consideration, teaching activities and performance or librarian effectiveness and performance, professional growth and achievement, service to the university and community, and any other activities which indicate professional commitment, service, or contribution to the discipline, department, school or library (in the case of librarians), university, or community.

In preparing resumes, applicants are encouraged to utilize the Faculty Resume Worksheet (CAM Appendix XII) as a guide.

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

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

To be recommended for tenure the employee must be rated during the final probationary year within one of the top two performance categories listed in Section V of the Faculty Evaluation Form.

6. Normal Tenure

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

7. Early Tenure

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

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

c. In order to receive early tenure, an applicant should, at a minimum, receive a favorable majority vote from the department peer review committee.

8. Tenure Upon Appointment

Candidates for appointment with tenure shall normally be tenured professors or tenured librarians at other universities--exceptions to this provision must be carefully documented. The President may award tenure to any individual, including one whose appointment and assignment is in an administrative position, at the time of appointment. Appointments with tenure shall be made only after an evaluation and recommendation by the appropriate department.
Background statement:

Evidence is mounting that interest in student participation in community service is growing rapidly throughout the nation.

And California is no exception. In Fall 1987, Assembly Bill 1820 was signed into law, creating the California Human Corps. The Bill mandates that, beginning Fall 1988, all students in the CSU and the UC shall be "strongly encouraged and expected, though not required" to contribute their time and talent to addressing some of the pressing human needs that our communities currently are facing.

Universities in both systems are responsible for developing a wide variety of attractive avenues to service. Students can choose to serve as volunteers, receive academic credit for service/learning, or obtain financial compensation for their work.

By 1993, it is expected that the CSU and UC campuses will significantly increase community service so that participation will approach 100% of students contributing an average of 30 hours for each year they are enrolled.

Both the California State Student Association and the Statewide Academic Senate have endorsed the Bill (while lobbying strongly and successfully against making service a requirement of students). However, no funds have been allocated to implement this Bill. Therefore, the Statewide Academic Senate has expressed great concern that the Bill not add to faculty workload without providing adequate compensation for faculty.

AB 1820 makes some specific requirements of CSU and UC including surveys of levels of participation. The survey will be included as part of the Student Needs And Priorities Survey (SNAPS) in February 1989. Provisions for surveying progress on an ongoing basis have not been developed. At Cal Poly, a survey of academic departments and of student clubs to identify existing service activities was conducted in Fall of 1985. The information is being updated during Fall 1988.

AB 1820 also requires each campus to establish a Human Corps Task Force to spearhead campus efforts. Cal Poly has established a Task Force composed of campus faculty, student and administrative leaders, city and county chief administrative officers, directors of the local United Way/Neighbors Helping Neighbors and of the Private Industry Council, and the Program Director from the County Superintendent of Schools' office.

This Task Force has developed a definition of community service to be used in developing the Human Corps program (see attached) as well as recommended to President Baker a statement of university commitment to the program. Subcommittees are being formed to address several issues and to make recommendations, including the relationship of Cal Poly's academic program to the Human Corps.
Cal Poly has in place a broad-based service program of instructionally-related and of student directed programs. (See attached brochure for details.) They presently involve at least 25% of Cal Poly students. Therefore, to increase participation, the initial approach is to utilize existing opportunities more fully.

Currently, one-half of all Cal Poly academic departments offer senior projects and/or internships or class projects that regularly result in service to the community.

Academic Affairs and Student Affairs have joined to create the Community Action Bureau (CAB), a computerized database of more than 300 community service opportunities. It is used by students to identify needed projects and to obtain referral to appropriate agency staff. Supervising senior projects, internships, or class projects that result in service need not be more time consuming to faculty nor more expensive than other types of senior projects because help in finding projects is available through CAB.

The Cal Poly Student Senate passed Resolution #88-08-Community Service endorsing Human Corps on November 28, 1987.

AS—-88/___

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF HUMAN CORPS AND OF SERVICE/LEARNING AT CAL POLY

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of Cal Poly, SLO has not gone on record as supporting Human Corps; and

WHEREAS, No vehicle exists for providing faculty input to the Human Corps program or for providing support to interested faculty through the exchange of ideas, sharing of resources, seeking of grant funds, or development of interdisciplinary service activities of faculty from different schools; and

WHEREAS, The senior project requirement provides the University a unique opportunity for service/learning; and

WHEREAS, There is no mechanism for measuring student service on an ongoing basis; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate support student participation in community service that is beneficial to the community AND to the student; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a faculty network similar to that employed in the Cooperative Education program be formed in support of Human Corps; that is, one individual in each department to be selected annually by his or her colleagues to serve as the Human Corps contact person; and be it further

RESOLVED: That, from this network, a Human Corps Task Force Academic Issues committee, composed of a representative from each school/Professional Consultative Services, be formed which will identify possibilities for new or interdisciplinary service/learning activities and will seek information and financial resources in support of faculty interested in developing service/learning activities; and be it further
RESOLVED: That students be encouraged to conduct senior projects that also provide service to the community; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Registrar’s Office be asked to develop a way to measure the level of student community service in conjunction with Fall Quarter Registration each Fall beginning Fall 1989.

Proposed By:
Instruction Committee
6-0-1
November 3, 1988

(The brochure referred to in paragraph eight of the background statement is enclosed in the envelope with your agenda. It is entitled "Catch It! It’s Catching On!")
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS—___—89/____

RESOLUTION ON
MINOR CAPITAL OUTLAY

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of San Jose State University approved, on November 23, 1987, a resolution that urged the Chancellor’s Office to designate a portion of the Minor Capital Outlay budget to the campuses as a lump sum for small modifications at the campuses’ discretion while being accountable for the funds expended; and

WHEREAS, The campus at California Polytechnic State University, as with all other California State University campuses, often require Minor Capital Outlay projects of less than $5,000; and

WHEREAS, The delays attributed to the formal Minor Capital Outlay process seem unwarranted for projects that cost less than $5,000; and

WHEREAS, The Chancellor’s Office has not yet made the desired adjustment to the Minor Capital Outlay process; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate support the Minor Capital Outlay Resolution passed by the Academic Senate of San Jose State University on November 23, 1987, and that the Academic Senate recommend to the Chancellor’s Office that it is in the best interest of the California State University system to modify the existing policy for Minor Capital Outlay projects.

Proposed By:
Budget Committee
November 29, 1988
At its meeting of November 23, 1987, the Academic Senate approved the following Sense-of-the-Senate Resolution presented by Peter Buzanski for the Financial and Student Affairs Committee.

**WHEREAS** Trustee Resolution RA 9-83-057 required the development of a charge-back system for services other than routine maintenance performed by Plant Operations, and

**WHEREAS** Campuses can no longer divert maintenance funds for teaching facilities modifications, due to the deterioration of the aging plant facilities, and

**WHEREAS** Trustee Resolution RA 9-83-057 excludes modifying buildings and extending or modifying utility systems from maintenance work, and

**WHEREAS** The funding of modifications of buildings, etc., is to be funded by Minor Capital Outlay for each project which will cost less than $200,000 but more than $5,000, and

**WHEREAS** The time frame for a Minor Capital Outlay project requires a minimum of three years for completion even if a request for funds is approved, and

**WHEREAS** Modern teaching facilities frequently require modifications which cost less than $5,000, and

**WHEREAS** Departmental budgets for Operating Expenses have not been supplemented to fund teaching facilities modifications since the effective date of Trustee Resolution RA 9-83-057; therefore be it

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate urge the Chancellor's Office to designate a portion of the Minor Capital Outlay budget to the campuses as a lump sum for small modification projects at the campuses' discretion, such funds to be expended on the basis of current minor capital guidelines, with campuses accountable for a post audit of the funds expended on an annual basis.
Background statement: The existing process and deadlines for the review of curricula for the catalog have become cumbersome. Due to the tremendous volume of materials submitted during a very short time span, major program proposals may not be receiving the consideration they deserve while minor alterations in course descriptions may consume more time than necessary. To add to the logjam of committee work, other curricula items must be tabled until catalog materials are cleared. In response to this problem noted by a general consensus of past Curriculum Committee members and representatives of the office of Academic Affairs, an altered timeline is being proposed along with a diagrammatic clarification of the flow of information during the curriculum review process.

RESOLUTION ON
THE CURRICULUM REVIEW PROCESS

WHEREAS, The current catalog cycle allows for faculty review at the university level for approximately two months and this presents a formidable burden to all those involved in the review process; and

WHEREAS, Curriculum review should be a consistent, ongoing process; and

WHEREAS, Some confusion may exist as to the flow of information during the curriculum review process; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the catalog cycle be refined beginning with the plans for the 1992-1994 version such that the first portion of the review process be concerned with program changes and proposals (proposals of new, or substantial changes in existing, minors, majors, concentrations, specializations, or programs) while the second part focuses on individual course changes; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the program proposals for the 1992-1994 catalog be submitted to the Academic Senate during the Fall 1989 and Winter 1990 quarters and that the individual course changes be submitted to the Academic Senate during the Fall 1990 and Winter 1991 quarters, and that this pattern be established for ensuing catalog cycles; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the accompanying diagram be used to not only clarify the flow of information for all curricula considerations but also to stress the degree of cooperation and responsibility expected at all levels of review.

Proposed By:
Curriculum Committee
November 10, 1988
The Curriculum Review Process

*Examples—Library, Student Academic Services, COOP
VII. COMMITTEES

I. COMMITTEE DESCRIPTIONS

5. Elections Committee

b. Responsibilities

The Elections Committee shall be responsible for supervising and conducting the election process for membership to the Academic Senate, Research Committee, University Professional Leave Committee, Senate offices, the statewide Academic Senate, appropriate recall elections for the preceding as per Section VIII of these bylaws, and ad hoc committees created to search for such university positions as president, vice president, and school deans, etc. . . .

(2) Election of Academic Senate members, Research Committee, and University Professional Leave Committee.

(a) At the March meeting of the Senate the committee shall announce impending vacancies in the Senate membership (according to the filled full-time equivalent faculty positions as of the first week of February, as listed by the University Personnel office), in the Research Committee, and in the University Professional Leave Committee. At the same time, each caucus shall be notified in writing of its vacancies.

(3) Election of members to the statewide Academic Senate:

The procedures and timetable for election of CSU Academic Senate members will be the same as that for the Senate, the University Professional Leave Committee, and the Research Committee, except that nomination shall be by petition of not less than ten members of the faculty and shall include a consent to serve statement signed by the nominee.

12. Research Committee

a. Membership

(1) One member shall be elected from each school and the library by the faculty of that unit.
(2) Membership shall be for two-year repeatable terms, with the terms of service staggered between the various schools and the library.

(a) Membership for the Schools of Agriculture, Architecture and Environmental Design, Business, and Engineering shall be for terms beginning in odd-numbered years, i.e., 1989.

(b) Membership for the Schools of Liberal Arts, Professional Studies and Education, Science and Mathematics, and the Library shall be for terms beginning in even-numbered years, i.e., 1990.

(3) The ex officio members of the Research Committee shall be the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development or his/her designee, an instructional dean or his/her designee, the Vice President for Business Affairs or his/her designee, and an ASI representative. The representative of the instructional deans shall be appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs for a two-year repeatable term.

(4) No member of the Research Committee is eligible to apply for any grant, leave, etc., administered by the Committee, while serving on the committee.

b. Responsibilities

The Research Committee shall:

3) Develop and recommend policies and procedures for the Research Committee, and for the administration of the State Funded Faculty Support Grants, to the president through the Academic Senate.

4) Solicit, receive, and evaluate requests for State Funded Faculty Support Grants and make recommendations for funding, when appropriate, to the president through the Academic Senate. Ex officio members shall be non-voting for these deliberations.

5) Evaluate requests

This section (VII.I.12.c.) becomes obsolete and
will be stricken from these bylaws June 30, 1989.

(1) Election for the Research Committee shall be held early in Winter Quarter 1989.

(2) Members elected from the Schools of Agriculture, Architecture and Environmental Design, Business, and Engineering shall serve two-year terms. Members elected from the Schools of Liberal Arts, Professional Studies and Education, and Science and Mathematics and the Library shall serve one year terms.

(3) The committee shall develop detailed operating procedures and criteria for evaluating State Funded Faculty Support Grants to be approved by the Senate before March 17, 1989.

(4) The committee shall develop criteria for evaluating CARE proposals in 1989-90 school year to be approved by the Senate before June 8, 1989.
OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES

The committees of the Academic Senate, both standing and ad-hoc, in compliance with Article VII Section 6 of the bylaws, must have an approved set of operating procedures on file in the office of the Academic Senate. Excepting elected committees, which must have specific operating procedures approved by the Senate, committees may elect to be governed by these procedures or must develop and submit for approval the procedures they will employ in the conduct of their charges.

1) Chairpersons shall be elected by the majority vote of the attending members at the first meeting of the academic year, called by the chair of the Senate. Chairpersons serve until the end of the academic year. In the event that a chairperson must miss a meeting, the chairperson shall appoint a substitute chairperson for that meeting.

2) Meetings shall be called at the discretion of the chairperson or upon the request of three members of the committee. Committees are required to meet at least once per quarter of the school year.

3) Notification of meetings shall be sent by the chairperson at least three working days before the meeting date. Committees may establish regular meeting times. Upon committee agreement, a regular meeting time shall constitute notice. Decisions made at meetings may not be challenged for lack of proper notice either if all members attend or if all sign statements waiving the notice requirement.

4) A simple majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum for a meeting. A quorum is required to conduct business.

5) Decisions of the committee must be made at meetings in which the attending members are in simultaneous communication with each other. This excludes telephone polling of members unless accomplished with conference phone with all members included.

6) Members may not vote by proxy.

7) A vote by the majority of the voting members attending a meeting shall be the decision of the committee.

8) Voting shall take place by a show of hands unless one attending member requests a secret ballot. The record shall show the resulting vote.

9) A committee report explaining the decision and noting the vote leading to the decision of the committee shall be filed at the Academic Senate office. Minority reports also may be filed with that office.