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RESOLUTION

RESOLVE: that the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, endorses the criteria for evaluating proposed minors.
RESOLUTION

RESOLVE: that the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, endorses CAM section 411 as revised and recommends that it be implemented.
CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING PROPOSED MINORS

The recommended University criteria for evaluating proposed minors are the following:

1. Clarification and specification of the competencies to be achieved in the minor.
2. Specification of the methods by which competencies are to be documented.
3. Review of the needed and available resources (staff, library, equipment) required to offer the minor.
4. If the unit proposing a minor is not an academic department, there must be specification of the composition of the group or committee that is sponsoring the minor. (This item is particularly important for interdisciplinary minors.)
5. External validation of minors where appropriate. (This item is important for any proposed minors which lack a qualified reviewing body on campus.)
6. The nature of student interest in the proposed minor.
7. Projected enrollment in the minor for the first, third, and fifth years of its existence.
8. Specification of possible negative impacts the proposed minor could have on existing programs in the curriculum.
RESOLUTION

RESOLVE: that the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, endorses the concept of minors at California Polytechnic State University.
REVISION OF CAM 411 TO PROVIDE FOR MINORS

411 (3) Minor

No minor is required for the bachelor's degree.

A minor is a formal aggregate of undergraduate courses classes in a specific subject area designed to give a student some basic knowledge or skill outside the field of his or her major documented competency in a secondary course of study. In contrast to options and concentrations it stands alone and is distinct from and outside the student's degree major.

The minor consists of 24 to 30 quarter units, of which at least half must be upper division. Twelve or more of the units in the minor must be in specified courses with the remainder, if any, to be chosen from an appropriate list.

Minors require the same academic review process and justification in terms of purpose, resources, need, etc., as do options and concentrations.
Background to Minors Issue

Upon receiving several departmental requests in 1978-79 to initiate minors, the Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate asked the Chair of the Academic Senate to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Minors to recommend criteria for evaluating proposed minors. While preparing said criteria, the Ad Hoc Committee determined: 1) that there was insufficient consultation with elected faculty representatives concerning minors prior to March 15, 1978, when then President Kennedy approved the revisions in CAM 411 creating academic minors, and 2) that the revisions in CAM 411 approved by the president were not inserted into the many CAM binders in various departments around campus thereby limiting the implementation of the new policy on minors.

In addition to devising criteria for evaluating proposed minors, the Ad Hoc Committee recommended that the Academic Senate fully debate the wisdom of having minors at Cal Poly on the grounds that belated consultation is better than no consultation at all.
Resolution Regarding Promotion Funding

Source: Personnel Policies Committee, October 1979

Approved as a business item by the Executive Committee, October 1979, by a vote of seven to six.

Background Rationale:

For years, before it was eliminated by ACR 70, the 60/40 rule maintained a "balance" between the available funds for promotion and the number of promotions recommended. Implicit in ACR 70 is the removal of artificial restrictions to promotion. Rather promotions shall be recommended "... in recognition of competence, professional performance, and meritorious service ..." as specified in CAM 342.2.B. Procedures to re-establish the "balance" between available promotion funds and the number of promotions recommended previously prepared by both an ad hoc ACR 70 Committee and the Personnel Policies Committee have not found acceptance.

Therefore, the present Personnel Policies Committee, after due consideration of prior studies, recommends the following procedures which can accomplish the necessary budgetary limitations, once merit has been recognized at all the consultative levels.

RESOLVED: That the following proposed CAM 342.2 changes be made:

J. Notices to faculty of approval of promotion, pending availability of funds, or nonpromotion are sent by the University President by May 1.

Insert between 342.2.b.2 and 342.2.c:

3. Procedure for distribution of funds for those approved for promotion by the University President.

a. Because external fiscal constraints may impose limitations of funds for promotions, funds will be divided among the departments by applying the wage-base formula used by the State to distribute funds among the campuses.

b. The appropriate group within a department will establish, in consultation with the appropriate parties, a priority list of its candidates for promotion based upon an evaluation of their relative merit.

c. Smaller fractional positions shall be pooled for departments which do not have funds for at least one promotion (if needed). Then fractional positions which require the least additional funds shall receive funds from positions that require additional but unavailable funds at the school level. This process will be repeated at the University level.
RESOLUTION ON THE ROLE OF THE PERSONNEL REVIEW COMMITTEE IN RELATION TO TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NEGATIVE KIND

BACKGROUND RATIONALE:

In the 1979-1980 Budget Year considerations regarding the granting of tenure, there were six cases in which an additional probationary year was granted instead of tenure. None of these cases was submitted to the Personnel Review Committee for investigation of possible procedural errors. The reason for this denial of review was President Kennedy's judgment that non-approval of tenure does not constitute a negative decision when the positive decision to grant an additional probationary year is made. Acting President Andrews sustained this interpretation by President Kennedy, but added that the Academic Senate might want to develop a proposal to clarify CAM 341.1.A for consideration by the permanent president in the Fall Quarter 1979.

WHEREAS, CAM 341.1.A includes tenure as one of the faculty personnel actions within the purview of the Personnel Review Committee; and

WHEREAS, CAM 341.1.A states that the Personnel Review Committee "... may review and make recommendations ... in those cases where there is disagreement among the recommendations made by the department committees, department heads, and school deans;" and

WHEREAS, CAM 344.2.F specifies that "the Vice President for Academic Affairs will submit to the Chairperson of the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate ... a list of all nonrecommended /for tenure/ personnel for review by the Committee;" and

WHEREAS, a denial of a tenure recommendation constitutes a negative recommendation for tenure, regardless of whether it is accompanied by a positive recommendation for an additional probationary year; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, recommend to the President that the Vice President for Academic Affairs be advised to include the names of all persons considered for tenure at any level, who are subsequently not approved, in the list of nonrecommended personnel submitted to the Chairperson of the Personnel Review Committee.
SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION REGARDING TEACHING OVERLOADS

WHEREAS, the faculty of this university have a commitment to excellence in teaching, a responsibility to provide their students with the best possible opportunity for education, and a responsibility to remain competent in their academic disciplines, and

WHEREAS, 36 WTU/year is the maximum teaching load that a university faculty member can reasonably be expected to carry and maintain the quality of teaching and level of professional competence required by a university teaching position, and

WHEREAS, too many faculty are already teaching more than 36 WTU/year, and

WHEREAS, teaching loads in excess of 36 WTU/year diminish the time available for students, the time available for class preparation, the time available to conduct the business of the department, and the time available to maintain professional competence to such a degree that the integrity of the university is threatened and the credibility of the university is called into question,

RESOLVES that no faculty member should be required to teach more than 36 WTU/year.
RESOLUTION TO MODIFY THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR

WHEREAS, The advent of computer assisted registration frees two days each quarter which must be included in the academic calendar; and

WHEREAS, It is desirable to have approximately equal numbers of each class days per quarter for scheduling purposes; and

WHEREAS, It is desirable for final examination periods to be separated from the last class meeting by at least two calendar days; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, recommends that the additional six days per academic year be utilized so that:

1. The first day of instruction in each quarter will be a Monday.

2. The last day of instruction in each quarter will be a Friday.

3. Final examination periods in each quarter be the week following the last day of instruction.

This resolution passed unanimously as amended. It was then agreed to forward the resolution and the accompanying support comments and material to the Executive Committee.
1. Allowing a student to add a lecture course as late as two weeks into the quarter could have very serious impact on his/her likely success in the class. Assignments, quizzes, and other activities would need to be completed in a very short time for the student to then be in step with the rest of the class.

2. Allowing a student to add a laboratory course two weeks into the quarter will result in the student missing the introductory lab sessions which often involve instruction in the proper use of the laboratory and its equipment for reasons of experimental technique and for student safety. And it may well render it impossible for the student to complete the required number of activities or experiments.

3. In some classes (seminars, for example), the role of each student is to be an active participant so that all of the students can benefit. Adding such a course two weeks late would preclude the student from both benefitting from and contributing to that portion of the course.

4. Faculty assume the responsibility of assisting students in their classes. Does that include helping a student make up two weeks work missed during the institutionally allowed add period?

5. Many students feel strongly about the need to have three weeks to evaluate a class in which they are enrolled in terms of the time commitment that will be involved.

6. No significant instructional problems occur in most courses simply by having a student drop the course at the end of the third week of instruction.

7. It is essential that the add and drop days not be the same day in order to allow a student who adds a course on the last possible day to still examine the course relative to his needs and other commitments and then drop it for less than "serious and compelling" reasons if necessary.
Notes and Comments Regarding the Proposed Calendar Modifications:

1. Meeting both the resolution requirements and the Chancellor's Council of Presidents adoption that 147 instructional days per academic year should be "typical", would require an eleven week Fall quarter (as we now have) with Veteran's Day and the normal three day Thanksgiving break as holidays, and ten week Winter and Spring quarters with one holiday in each (Washington's Birthday and Memorial Day, respectively). The total number of instruction days is 149 in every year.

2. Meeting the resolution requirements and the Council of Presidents adopted minimum of 170 academic work days per academic year would require a full week in the Fall quarter for the Fall Conference and academic planning, a full week (five days) each quarter for examinations and end of quarter evaluation, and commencement day.

3. The calendar that results from 1 and 2 above and the resolution has the following features:
   a. There are no fewer than nine equivalent class days in any quarter--and the equivalent number of class days per quarter is typically ten.
   b. Final examination periods are separated by a weekend from the last day of instruction.
   c. There is one full week of academic holiday between the Winter and Spring quarters and three full weeks between Fall and Winter quarters.
   d. Allowing five days per final exam period could:
      i. Allow distribution of exams over five days in order to reduce the crowding in the exam schedule (and perhaps eliminate the 7:00 AM exam slot);
      ii. Include the possibility of an additional "dead day" between classes and finals (which would then begin on Tuesday of exam week) to allow for additional study, office consultation, or an official final deadline for submitting papers, etc.;
      iii. Include as an official academic work day an evaluation day set aside for reading final exams and papers and for submitting grades. Such an evaluation day is authorized by the Council of Presidents, but is not currently included in our calendar.
      iv. Eliminate the current practice of certain classes (Friday classes meeting once per week) holding final exams on the last class day.
10 weeks (Independence Day)

1 week Holiday

11 weeks (Thanksgiving) Veteran's Day

3 weeks Holiday

10 weeks (Washington's Birthday)

1 week Holiday

10 weeks (Memorial Day)

52 weeks Total
RESOLUTION REGARDING THE ADD/DROP PERIOD

WHEREAS, A student adding a course or laboratory as late as the end of the second week of classes will miss twenty percent of the quarter's activity in that course (which may include quizzes, homework assignments, experiments, or other individual or group activities, lectures, demonstrations, etc.), and

WHEREAS, Offering the right to add a class implies the reasonable possibility that the student can fully participate in the class and successfully complete it, and

WHEREAS, The full participation of every student in some classes (especially seminars and activity classes) affects the conduct and success of the class for all students, and

WHEREAS, A student should be offered sufficient time after enrolling in a course (or adding it) to evaluate the approach, perceived value, and required levels of preparation and time commitment for the course, therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of CPSU opposes the proposed change in the period in which a student is allowed to add a course in favor of retaining the current policy that no class can be added after the first week of instruction. And be it also

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of CPSU opposes the proposed change in the period in which a student is allowed to drop a course without petition in favor of retaining the current policy allowing three full weeks to drop a course.