I. Call to order

II. Approval of the minutes of February 10, 1970 meeting. 

Under Announcements and Information items regarding status of previous Senate action:
Item IV, A, 1, concerning availability of pay vouchers should be deleted as incorrect.

III. Announcements and Information Items
A. Committee Appointments
1. Distinguished Teacher Awards Committee - Add Art Butzbach as Vice President Andrews' appointment.
2. SAC representative replacing Bart Olson.
3. Personnel Policy Committee replacing Sarah Hardeman for the Spring Quarter only - Phil Overmeyer.
4. Elections Committee replacing D. Sobala, --Tom Carpenter.

B. Proposed Salary Schedule (Attachment A)

C. Committee Reports
1. Personnel Policy Committee - A. Rosen
2. Personnel Review Committee - R. Frost (Attachment B)
3. Student Affairs Committee - R. Pautz
4. Instruction Committee - T. Johnston (Attachment C)
5. Elections Committee - J. Stuart
6. Others

D. Spring Quarter Meetings
Tuesday, April 7 - Executive Committee
Tuesday, April 14 - Academic Senate
Tuesday, May 5 - Executive Committee
Tuesday, May 12 - Academic Senate
Tuesday, May 19 - Academic Senate (Tentative)
Tuesday, May 26 - Academic Senate (Tentative)

E. Statewide Academic Senate Report - R. Anderson

IV. Business Items
A. Second reading of proposed amendments to the Bylaws,

B. Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Structure and Organization (Attachment C)

C. Report of Research Committee (Attachments D, E)

D. Report of Elections Committee - First reading of an amendment to the Bylaws to provide for the election of a Faculty Disciplinary Committee (To be handed out)

V. Adjournment
MEMORANDUM

March 10, 1970

FROM: Ad Hoc committee on salary schedule (Kramer, Langsdorf, Romberg, Adams, Graves, Kirschner, Shelton and Moore)

SUBJECT: SALARY SCHEDULE PROPOSAL, CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

I. GENERAL

The proposed schedule is shown with step designations, salary levels, normal times in steps and the requirements for merit evaluation in Table I. It is shown again in Table II, with only the step designations and salary levels, to illustrate the overlapping of salary steps between ranks. The existing salary scale, effective July 1, 1969, is shown, for comparison, in Table III.

The four principles agreed upon by the Presidents, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, and the Chancellor and the Trustees are reflected in the Trustees' Committee on Faculty and Staff Affairs Resolution RPSA 69-32 and are repeated here. Their implementation by the proposed schedule is discussed below.

(1) Elimination of Class I (non-Ph.D.) salaries;
(2) Overlapping of salary ranges by rank;
(3) Flexibility of use of salary steps; and
(4) Evaluation for merit increases, details to be determined upon completion of the board's study on the retention and procurement of a quality faculty.*

II. ELIMINATION OF CLASS I SALARIES

All of the proposed salary levels either correspond exactly to existing Class II levels, or to those levels corrected by restoring the five percent interval between the Assistant Professor V and Associate Professor I steps. The overlap steps correspond exactly to steps in the next higher rank. The first-year cost of converting to the new schedule would consist partly of restoring the five percent intervals, in which case Associate Professors and Professors would receive annual increases varying from $115 (Associate Professor step I) to $176 (Professor step V).

The elimination of Class I designations will have a first-year cost, based on the following plan. All of those who, at the time of implementation, are in Class I and have been more than one year in step 5 of their ranks would be moved to Class II, step 5 of their ranks, thus receiving increases of five percent. All of those in Class I step 1 of their ranks would be moved to Class II, step 1 and receive 5 percent increases. All those in

*See footnote, page 3
Class I steps 2, 3, and 4, and those in step 5 less than one year would be moved to Class II at one lower step and would receive no increase until their next anniversary dates. In these cases eligibility for promotion would not be delayed by this retention in a given step for two years; but rather by elapsed time, so that eligibility would occur at step 4.

III. OVERLAPPING OF SALARY RANGES BY RANK

Instructor salaries presently overlap Assistant Professor salaries by three steps. The overlap is retained, and Instructor salaries are changed only by the elimination of Class I.

Assistant Professor salaries have steps 6, 7, and 3 added, with salaries equivalent to Associate Professor 1, 2 and 3 (see Table II). Similarly, steps 6, 7, and 8 are added to the Associate Professor rank. Each overlap step has a one-year normal interval for entry from the next lower step for Assistant Professors and a one or two-year normal interval for Associate Professors. Step 3 of each of these two ranks may be occupied indefinitely, if promotion does not occur. It must be emphasized that one or two years are only "normal" expectations, reinforced at most steps by required review at the indicated intervals. Shorter or longer times in steps must be a part of the flexibility proposed below. Overlap steps provide for monetary reward without the next higher rank being awarded at the time. Rank and salary thus no longer correspond in a fixed way. This relieves the pressure to promote for economic as opposed to other professional reasons. At the same time it makes irrelevant, from a cost point of view, control from off of the campus over the ratio of upper to lower ranks.

The existence of overlap steps also aids in recruiting. Markets fluctuate among different disciplines, requiring varying levels of initial appointment salary steps. The existence of overlap steps relieves the pressure to consider the new probationary faculty member for promotion in order to increase his salary after the first or second year, if he should have been appointed at step 4 or 5. Procedures must be cleared up so that a person may be promoted from any rank step to the next rank in the next (5% higher) salary step. There must be no implication in the adoption of a new schedule that initial appointments need be made at first or second steps. Adjustment of the initial appointment step to market conditions and the qualifications of the individual is essential to procurement of a quality faculty. New position budget funds are now based on the salary at step 3 of the Assistant Professor rank.

IV FLEXIBILITY IN USE OF SALARY STEPS

The regular and overlap salary steps must be available for flexibility in providing for different ratio of progress of faculty members, depending on their merits. A multiple-step increment within a rank in any year must be possible to reward unusual merit. Similarly, of course, where review is required, failure to recommend any step increment must be considered a response of colleagues to performance which they deem to be below the expected. When a schedule step increase is not recommended, review must take place at the normal interval, whether it be one, two or three years. Flexibility must also be available for the Professor rank. Three additional steps are provided, to be in no sense interpreted as "super" or "outstanding professor" steps. It is intended that these three additional steps be funded.
The professional requirements of each field, applied ever more stringently as one moves through academic experience, should screen but encourage and reward those of the Professor rank.

V EVALUATION FOR MERIT INCREASES

The simplicity and economic justice of annual small salary increments within rank are combined with merit reviews* for several steps in this proposal. Annual reviews for everyone would be redundant and burdensome. A typical faculty member is now evaluated six times after initial appointment as Assistant Professor; for second, third and fourth probationary appointments, for tenure and for two promotions. In addition, if he is held at the top step of a rank for more than one year, he may be evaluated in each of those added years. The proposal would add salary step reviews for the fourth step of each of the two upper ranks, for the third and fifth steps of the Assistant Professor rank and for all Instructor steps. Review would be required for each salary step above the fifth.

In any case where promotion is not given from the top salary step of a rank, review for salary step increase would occur at the end of one year. On some campuses, the person so held at a top step must be considered for promotion each year. Thus salary step consideration only adds one more possibility as a result of a review required in these cases by present rules. For Associate Professors moved to step 6 and 7, two-year maximum salary review intervals are required by the proposal.

* In keeping with principle 4 (I (4) above) the exact nature of and the criteria for merit reviews are left open pending the completion of the study by the ad hoc committee on the retention and procurement of a quality faculty. On all campuses, merit reviews are now conducted for retention and promotion according to criteria and procedures agreed to locally. Nothing in this proposal should be interpreted so as to question or suggest alterations in local criteria or procedures.
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### Table I

**PROPOSED REVISED ACADEMIC SALARY SCHEDULE, CSC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Normal time in step (yrs.)</th>
<th>Review necessary to arrive at step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>$ 8,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>By initial appt. only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>9,324</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>10,204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>10,204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>10,204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asst. Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>10,204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>10,204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>11,344</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>11,344</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td>12,499</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7</td>
<td>13,124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8</td>
<td>13,124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assoc. Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>12,499</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>13,124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>14,464</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>15,153</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td>15,952</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7</td>
<td>16,750</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td>yes (promotion review)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE I

**PROPOSED REVISED ACADEMIC SALARY SCHEDULE, CSC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Normal time in step (yrs.)</th>
<th>Review necessary to arrive at step yes (promotion review)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>$15,552</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>15,750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>18,457</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>19,380</td>
<td>3**</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td>20,360</td>
<td>3**</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7</td>
<td>21,378</td>
<td>3**</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8</td>
<td>22,447</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* At none of these steps is review required for the salary increment, but review for reappointment takes place for any probationary faculty member each year. A candidate may arrive at any of these steps by review and promotion from lower rank.

**While review in the 3rd, 5th, 7th, etc., years is normal—in these steps, shorter or longer periods in each step should not be considered unusual. Merit alone and not budget considerations must be the basis for advancement to steps 6, 7, and 8.**
### TABLE II

OVERLAP BY RANK OF PROPOSED SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>$8,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>9,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>9,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>10,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>10,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>$9,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>10,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>11,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>11,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td>12,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7</td>
<td>13,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8</td>
<td>13,780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>$12,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>13,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>13,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>14,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>15,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td>15,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7</td>
<td>16,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8</td>
<td>17,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>15,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>16,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>17,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>18,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>19,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td>20,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7</td>
<td>21,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8</td>
<td>22,447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor I</td>
<td>$ 0460</td>
<td>$ 0892</td>
<td>$ 2324</td>
<td>$ 9804</td>
<td>$10244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0892</td>
<td>2324</td>
<td>5804</td>
<td>10284</td>
<td>10284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor I</td>
<td>9324</td>
<td>9804</td>
<td>10284</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>11340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>9804</td>
<td>10284</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>11340</td>
<td>11340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor I</td>
<td>11208</td>
<td>12304</td>
<td>13008</td>
<td>13644</td>
<td>14320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>12304</td>
<td>13008</td>
<td>13644</td>
<td>14320</td>
<td>15036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor I</td>
<td>15035</td>
<td>15804</td>
<td>16608</td>
<td>17424</td>
<td>18220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>15035</td>
<td>15804</td>
<td>16608</td>
<td>17424</td>
<td>18220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I  Education and experience deemed equivalent to possession of a college degree

II  Doctorate
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MEMORANDUM

TO: David Grant, Chairman
Academic Senate

FROM: Personnel Review Committee
(R. H. Frost, Chairman)

SUBJECT: Personnel Policies Meriting Study by the Academic Senate

DATE: March 10, 1970

In reviewing recommendations for reappointment of second and third year faculty and for the granting of tenure, the Personnel Review Committee has encountered problems which merit study by the Academic Senate, and possible Senate recommendations for improvement of College procedures or policy.

1. The review of the Committee was seriously limited by the fact that the College schedule of deadlines for these recommendations provided only one week for this review. Because of conflicts in the schedules of Committee members, and the Academic Senate requirement that all faculty members or their alternates be present, the Committee was able to find only six daytime meeting hours in this period of November 13-20, and met for an additional nine hours at night. Thirteen of these meeting hours were during the last three days of the period. One or more of the following alternatives could make the work of the Committee more effective:

   (a) A change in these deadlines.

   (b) Some procedure for alerting the Committee in advance of particular situations which would require special review: cases where there is disagreement in the recommendations made by the department committee, department head, and school dean, or in which a faculty member believes that unusual circumstances have resulted in an unjust decision.

   (c) Provision for temporary released time for at least part of the Committee to facilitate the scheduling of meetings during the review period.

2. Better communication should be provided between tenured faculty, department heads, deans, and the probationary faculty, to make evaluation for reappointment and tenure more effective, reduce serious misunderstandings, and avoid some instances of apparent injustice to individuals.

   (a) On the departmental level there is a need for written statements of the requirements for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, especially in terms of requirements for additional formal study for professional development and the attainment of advanced degrees.

   (b) The annual evaluation should include a statement about the progress of the individual towards tenure and the removal of any previously noted deficiencies.
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(c) The yearly evaluation of the academic dean should be provided to the individual concerned so that he may take the necessary steps to improve his professional competence.

It is also necessary for the effective operation of this Committee that a negative recommendation by the dean on reappointment or tenure should be reported to the individual involved. An unfortunate situation developed this year because the College Administrative Manual does not require this, with the result that in one situation the Committee could not inform the individual that it was reviewing his case without alerting him to an unexpected and previously unknown negative recommendation by his dean.

3. Differences in the interpretation of the College Evaluation Form produce misunderstandings and possible inequities. In particular, the College Administrative Manual section 344.2-4 statement that "To be recommended for tenure the employee should qualify in one of the first two performance categories listed on the last page of the Evaluation Form" is not uniformly interpreted, and many faculty members appear unaware of it.

4. The College policy on employment of relatives appears to differ from the impression given by the wording in the College Administrative Manual section 11.5. This section states that "such employment may be authorized when shown to be in the best interest of the College," subject to certain restrictions. The present interpretation of this rule appears to be that such employment is automatically considered to be against the best interests of the College in most cases. Differing interpretations of this rule have led to unfortunate misunderstandings and accusations of bad faith. This policy should be reviewed to serve the best interests of the College and to avoid future misunderstanding.
TO: Members of the Academic Senate
FROM: Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Structure and Organization
SUBJECT: Recommended Instructional Schools and Disciplines

March 10, 1970

1. School of Agriculture and Natural Resources
   - Ag Hort (Ag Bus Hort, For Hort)
   - Ag Ed
   - Ag Engr (Soil Ag)
   - Animal Sci
   - Crops (Field Pro)
   - Dairy Sci
   - Food Ed
   - Nat Res Mgmt
   - Orn Hort
   - Poultry Sci
   - Soil Sci
   - Vet Sci (Animal Tech)

2. School of Engineering and Technology
   - Aero
   - Electrical
   - Electronic
   - Engr Tech
   - Environmental
   - Industrial Engr
   - Industrial Tech
   - Mechanical
   - Metallurgy & Welding Tech
   - Textile Engr

3. School of Architecture and Environmental Design
   - Architecture
   - Arch Engr
   - City & Reg Planning
   - Constr Engr
   - Landscape Arch

4. School of Business and Social Sciences
   - Business (Actng, FPM, IR, Mgmt, Marketing)
   - Economics
   - Pol Sci, Soc Sci, Geog

5. School of Science and Mathematics
   - Biology (Bact, Bot, Conserv, Ent.
   - Zoology)
   - Chemistry
   - Computer Sci
   - Statistics
   - Mathematics
   - Physics (Phys Sci)
   - Military Sci

6. School of Human Development and Education
   - Education (AV Instruction)
   - Child Devel
   - Home Economics
   - Behavioral Sci (Soc, Anthro, Psych)
   - Physical Ed

7. School of Communicative Arts and Humanities
   - English
   - Speech-Drama
   - Journalism
   - Art
   - Music
   - Foreign Lang & Linguistics
   - History
   - Printing (Graphic Communication)
   - Philosophy

Unassigned to Instructional Schools
- Library
  - AV (Services & Production)
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Section 386.6 Special Leaves for Research or Creative Activity.

The first paragraph is amended as follows:

The program for special leaves for Research or Creative Activity was established by the State Legislature and is set forth in the California Administrative Code Title V Sections 43050-43053 and the annual Budget Act. The College Research Committee is responsible for reviewing applications and making a recommendation to the Academic Vice President. This type of leave with pay permits faculty members to undertake specified research projects or creative activity leaves for one quarter or two quarters on full time pay. This-type of leave provides that research includes all systematic studies conducted for the expansion of knowledge in any field of learning appropriate to the function of the College and also includes creative work in the Arts and Humanities as well as scientific and technological investigation. Forms and additional information on this program are available from the Office of Research and Development.

1. Calendar for Processing Research and Creative Activity Leave Applications

   a. October 19 - Applications for winter and spring quarter Research or Creative Activity leaves are due in the department head's office.
   
   b. October 20 - November 1 Department head sends applications with recommendations to school deans.
   
   c. October 27 - November 6 - School dean forwards applications with recommendations to the College Research Committee c/o Director, Research and Development, for review and action recommendation. A copy of the transmittal letter is also sent to the Academic Vice President.
   
   d. November 4 - December 1 - College Research Committee forwards applications with recommendations to Academic Vice President.
   
   e. November 17 - December 10 - President transmits leave requests with recommendations to Chancellor. (Approval requires concurrence of Chancellor's Office. Applicants are notified by the Academic Vice President when approval is received.)

   f. --March 13--Applications for fall quarter research and creative activity leaves are due in the department head's office.
2. Relationship to Sabbatical Leaves

The special leave program is separate and distinct from the sabbatical leave program. Award of a research or creative activity leave has no effect on sabbatical leave eligibility, and time spent on a special leave shall be counted toward the service required to establish eligibility for a sabbatical. Special research or creative leaves will not be granted for a term immediately preceding or following a sabbatical leave.

3. Eligibility

Only full time members of the teaching faculty are eligible to receive these special leaves. Nontenured faculty are eligible and the term of such leave shall be counted as part of the probationary period.

4. Obligation to Teach Following Leave

A faculty member who is granted and who takes a research or creative leave shall be obligated to teach in the State Colleges for the equivalent of two terms for each term of leave immediately following the conclusion of such leave; provided that the completion of such obligation shall be deferred during periods, following such leave, taken as vacation, sabbatical leave, or leave of absence without pay; and provided further, that this obligation shall be further deferred for any period during which the employee is in military service. This obligation shall be exonerated if the failure of the employee to complete such service following the conclusion of the leave is caused by his death or physical or mental disability, or dismissal for cause.

5. Faculty Replacement

The awarding of a leave is dependent upon the availability of a qualified substitute.

6. Use of college facilities

The project should not interfere with the normal use of laboratory or classroom space furnished by the State.
Research Activities

The college research program is under the general coordination of the Director of Research and Development who reports to the Academic Vice-President.

The primary application of research activities and findings at California State Polytechnic College should be improvement in effectiveness of instruction and, therefore, of student success and retention. Research activities to improve instruction should include concern with updating curricula or planning new curricula to better serve the needs of employers of Cal-Poly graduates. Where feasible, research activities should assist in providing appropriate training and involvement of undergraduate students. Faculty and staff members are encouraged to engage in research projects that will strengthen the instructional program of the College. Research activities should contribute to the fund of knowledge in the technical fields involved and/or to the improvement of instruction in all fields.

The Research and Development effort of the College is a joint enterprise encouraged and guided by the Administration of the College and the Academic Senate. To give direction to this effort, the College Research Committee was established as a committee of the Academic Senate. The Research Committee directs its recommendations affecting College-wide policies and procedures to both the Academic Senate and the Academic Vice President. The Office of Research and Development was established on September 1, 1968 with the appointment of a Research Director. The Director is responsible to the Academic Vice President and is permanent secretary to the College Research Committee.

Section 452.8 It is the responsibility of the project director, who may be the staff member so designated by mutual consent of the group wishing to conduct the research activity, to develop the proposal. Research project requests, to be supported by the College budget or other sources, should be prepared in accordance with established procedures and must be reviewed at all appropriate levels and approved by the College Research Committee and the Director of Research and Development. Projects of an interdisciplinary nature should be reviewed by the several subject areas involved. Signatures are required from the Department Head, School Dean, Director of Business Affairs, Foundation Manager, Director of Research and Development, and the Academic Vice President/President for all proposals. Information on sources of funding and program application forms may be obtained from the Office of Research and Development.
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POLICY

The California State Polytechnic College, by its very nature, has an obligation to serve the public interest. In order to do this effectively, it is necessary that the College have a patent program which will make inventions rising in the course of College research available in the public interest under conditions that will promote effective development and utilization.

The College also recognizes its need to assist staff members and students of the College in all matters related to patents based on discoveries and inventions developed in situations including those in which the College has no vested interest, i.e., those which are developed by a staff member or student on his own time and without the use of College facilities.

It is recognized that inventions may and frequently do involve activities beyond those of the inventor himself. The use of College facilities or services, the particular assignment of duties or conditions of employment, the possible claims of a cooperating agency, as in research supported from extramural funds; these and other situations give rise to a complex of interrelated equities or rights involving the inventor, the College, and a cooperating agency. Such rights or equities must be appraised and an agreement reached on the proper disposition of them in accordance with the following procedures:

a. Patentable research and inventions anticipated or resulting from research conducted at the college shall be reported to the College Research Committee.

b. The Director, Research and Development, with the assistance and concurrence of the Foundation Manager, shall pursue the patent and licensing features with the inventor and the California State Polytechnic College Foundation. This agreement should be endorsed by the College Research Committee and the Academic Vice President.

c. The patent and license rights shall be assigned to the California State Polytechnic College Foundation with the inventor sharing in the net returns. The Foundation may seek the services of a non-profit patenting corporation to secure patent and licensing of the invention.

d. Research work financed wholly or in part by an outside sponsor comes under the special provisions of the contract covering such work. Staff members and students engaged in such research work are bound by the provisions incorporated in the agreement covering their work.

e. An invention in which the College has no vested interest, i.e., one which is developed by the inventor on his own time and without the use of College facilities, may be voluntarily submitted to the Research Committee and the Foundation for consideration as to its patentability and for subsequent processing and exploitation if accepted. In such case, the inventor will participate in the net profits derived from the patent on the basis mutually agreeable.
f. If the College or the Foundation decides not to undertake the patenting of an invention, the College and the Foundation shall then waive all rights to the invention and the inventor shall be free to take such steps as he may wish at his own expense.

To appraise and determine relative rights and equities of all patents concerned, to facilitate patent applications, licensing, equitable distribution of royalties, if any, to obtain funds for research, and to provide a uniform procedure in patent matters, where such originate within the College, the College has adopted this patent policy and procedures.
POLICY AND PROCEDURES CONCERNING INDIRECT COSTS
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

1. Introduction

Indirect costs, as distinguished from direct costs, are those which are not entirely identifiable to the costs of carrying on a specific program. These costs are a reimbursement to an institution for the general and administrative costs incurred in conducting research and development projects. Funds reimbursed from this source are college income and are not a means of providing further direct support for the specific project under which they were reimbursed.

2. Policy for Seeking Indirect Costs

The college shall seek indirect costs for each research and development project whether administered through the State of California or the California State Polytechnic College Foundation. The rate should be 25% of the direct costs of the proposal. Exceptions will necessarily be made to accommodate established grantee policies and, in unusual cases, those proposals approved by the Director, Research and Development. Unresolved rates may be taken to the College Research Committee for consideration.

3. Methods of Accumulation of Indirect Funds

Regardless of whether or not a particular project is administered fiscally by the college’s office of Business Affairs (State) or by the Foundation Business Office, all indirect funds shall be accumulated in the following manner:

A. At the beginning of a fiscal year, the Director of Business Affairs for the college and the Foundation Manager each shall develop an estimated cost of administration of research and development projects for the year.

B. As individual projects are billed for recovery of generated indirect costs, the respective business offices may utilize a proportionate share of their estimates for the financial administration of the projects.

C. All other funds shall be placed in a trust account.

4. Procedure for Utilization

At the beginning of a fiscal year the Director, Research and Development, in cooperation with the Director of Business Affairs and the Foundation manager, shall report the income from indirect costs from all projects to the Research Committee and develop an expenditure proposal which shall include the following:

A. Income, including any balances of unused indirect costs from the previous year remaining in the Trust Accounts.

B. Estimated funds required for the State of California share of indirect costs.
C. Estimated funds needed for postaudit purposes.

D. Costs of Foundation administration.

E. Uncommitted funds available for utilization by the college.

The above statement shall be prepared with the assistance and approval by the Director of Business Affairs and the Foundation Manager.

5. Policy on Utilization of Uncommitted Indirect Costs

Each year, the College Research Committee shall recommend to the Academic Vice President a division of the remaining uncommitted funds for the following purposes:

A. Small Grants Program for Faculty Research and Development.

B. Project Development Funds

C. College Equipment Program

Upon notification of the approved distribution of funds, the College Research Committee shall announce the programs on a college-wide basis and the procedures for an award system. Final approval of College Research Committee recommendations will rest with the Academic Vice President and President.
To: Dr. David Grant, Chairman  
   Academic Senate and  
   Members of the Instruction Committee

From: Thomas Johnston, Chairman  
   Instruction Committee

Subject: A. N. Landyshev Memo and  
   M. E. Whitson Memo

The Instruction Committee requests that its deliberations on the A. N. Landyshev memo be read as a report at the next Academic Senate meeting.

The committee accepts in principle the intent of the memo but is unwilling to move for acceptance until the subject has been examined by a larger cross section of the faculty.

In its deliberations the Instruction Committee wishes the following facts to be recorded.

(a) It was to be clearly understood that adoption of a Numerical grading system cancelled the present alphabetical descriptive phrase.

(b) The five point system would use the addition of one digit to the right of the decimal point allowing more finite recording of grades.

(c) The use of numerical grading would be more in line with the State-wide system and avoids the necessity to transpose alphabetical symbols to number symbols.

(d) Title 5, section 40104 of the State College Code is not violated by such a change.

(e) Room exists on the present computer card system for numerical evaluation, but the recording of "W", "WF" and "AUD" grades would need to be brought in line.

(f) It is conceivable that transfer students would suffer in the conversion to a numerical system.

(g) Committee members in further discussion indicated that in essence the proposed change is insignificant in relation to the overall grading pattern and as the committee that initiated the grading study tabled by L. H. Dunigan, further time to study this would be desirable to ensure that any existing problems are not compounded with the suggested change.

Attachment G
M. E. Whitson Memo

Considerable discussion was focused on the intent of this memo. It was felt it constituted a philosophical question. The committee considers the following facts relevant and worthy of recording.

(a) The "WF" serves a very real purpose and should be retained.

(b) Examination of the "Grade frequency distribution for Fall 1968," provides little justification for the elimination of the "WF."

(c) To effect a change it would be necessary to alter the time factor as it relates to the "W" and "WF." There is no advantage to students unless they are able to add a class at the end of the first week.

(d) A mandatory "W" was unacceptable without a qualifying time factor.

(e) The elimination of the word "Penalty" from pages 4-8 of the current catalogue.

(f) Serious consideration be given to limiting the number of "W's" any student may accumulate in any given quarter.

(g) The committee is alert to the fact that students use the system to avoid incurring a poor grade which would reflect in the G.P.A.

Moved by Dr. Burroughs
Seconded by Dr. Pendse

"That the M. E. Whitson memo be not accepted on the grounds that

(a) It does not solve the problem.

(b) It does not permit the essential opportunity for students to add a course.

(c) The current 'Grading Frequency Chart Analysis' does not support the contention that a serious problem exists."