AGENDA

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

2:00 p.m. - Staff Dining Room

Attention: Please note the starting time - 2:00 p.m.

I. Call to order

II. Approval of previous minutes

III. Information Items

A. Committee year-end reports

1. Fairness Board - (Lewellyn)

"The Fairness Board processed one case during 1968-69. It involved grading. The student felt his grade of 'WF' should have been changed to 'E'. The Fairness Board's decision was 'no merit'. The decision was unanimous.

"During this academic year the parent committee (Student Affairs Committee) strengthened the Fairness Board Process by amending the by-laws so that a recommended action in favor of the student could be implemented by the President of the College."

2. Outstanding Teacher Awards - (Dr. Andrews)

3. Personnel Policy Committee - (Rosen) Verbal report of work in progress

4. Student Affairs Committee - (Pautz) - Verbal report of work in progress

5. Ad hoc/Organization - (Grant) - Verbal

IV. Business Items

A. Committee year-end reports

1. Budget Committee - (Andreoli) - Request to approve resolution - (Attachment I)

2. Grievance Committee - (Sankoff) - Revisions to Faculty Grievance Procedure, Administrative Bulletin 69-1 - (Attachment II)
3. Instruction Committee - (Frost) - Requests for action on: (Attachment III)
   a. Recommendation for grading study
   b. Video-tape recorder guidelines
   c. Pass-Fail grading
   d. Revisions to ASSIST program

4. Research Committee - (Rodin) - Request for approval to recommend:
   a. College Patent Policy - (Attachment IV)
   b. Policy on use of overhead funds obtained by Research Projects (Attachment IV)
   c. Amendment to CAM on Research and Creative Leaves (Attachment IV)
   d. Amendment to CAM on Research (Attachment IV)

B. Introduction of New Chairman - (Keif)

V. Announcements

VI. Adjournment
Whereas:

Laboratory facilities were designed with the present utilization formula in mind, and are presently being used to maximum capacity. Any increase in utilization would possibly create safety problems, and increase the overcrowded conditions already in existence, and whereas

Faculty office space is already in short supply; increasing the utilization factors will only tend to compound the problem, and whereas

Recruiting of faculty will become more difficult because of the unusual hours required by the increased utilization formula, and whereas

The instructional program will be inhibited due to the fact that the opportunity for student-faculty contact will become more difficult, and whereas

The proposed change will contribute to a decrease in faculty and student morale, and therefore, contribute to a general unrest, therefore be it

Resolved that the Academic Senate, as the representative body of the faculty, strongly oppose the implementation of the proposal to increase the present utilization standards as set forth in the 1969-70 Legislative Analyst Report, and be it further resolved

That we recommend that the President take a similar stand.
PROPOSED REVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE BULLETIN 69-1
TITLED
REVISED FACULTY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

1.0 Background

1.1 The Academic Senate approved the revised procedure on January 28, 1969.
1.2 An amendment adding section 3 was approved by the Senate on February 11, 1969.
1.3 The resulting Administrative Bulletin 69-1 was issued on February 17, 1969.
1.4 The 69-1 was sent to the office of General Counsel of the Chancellor's office for review and comment.

2.0 Response

2.1 On April 2, the office of General Counsel replied with fourteen specific suggestions for improvement. These suggestions are identified below by "OGC."
2.2 The Grievance committee made several proposed changes to incorporate most of the suggestions. These changes are shown below as "CHANGE."
2.3 On May 23, Grievance Committee chairman Leo Sankoff forwarded these changes and comments about them to the Chairman of the Senate. The comments are identified below by "COMM."

3.0 Results

OGC-1 "...some provision should be made for making the Procedures available to the faculty."
COMM-1 "The committee felt that procedures now in use were adequate. The Procedures are available through the College Administrative Manual (CAM) ...... and announcements in Cal Poly Report.

OGC-2 "......provide for a procedure to be followed if a subcommittee member becomes unavailable part way through a grievance hearing".
COMM-2 "A section was added to paragraph 1.235....".
CHANGE 1.235 Members of the sub-committee will be appointed by the chairman of the Committee from the committee members who have not been disqualified. The sub-committee will select its own chairman.  IN CASE A SUB-COMMITTEE MEMBER BECOMES UNAVAILABLE, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE MAY APPOINT ANOTHER MEMBER TO THE SUB-COMMITTEE OR DIRECT THE REMAINING MEMBERS TO CONTINUE WITH THE HEARING. THE ACTION TO BE ENDORSED BY THE GRIEVANT AND PERSONS DIRECTLY INVOLVED.

OGC-3 "Since a grievance can (also) arise out of actions of committees. ...and from working conditions, paragraph 2.11 should be modified.....".
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COMM-3 "This section was revised by the addition of eight words."

CHANGE 2.1 DEFINITIONS
2.11 A grievance is a complaint arising out of an alleged unauthorized or unjustified action by an administrative officer which in any affects the employment status or other rights or privileges of the faculty, OR ANY OTHER GROUNDS RELATED TO SECTION 1.11. Administrative officers, for this purpose shall include department heads, deans of schools and other officers of the College.

OGC-4 "The exception in subparagraph 2.22 should be conditioned by adding a phrase such as: "subject to the limitations contained in para. 3 of Revised Grievance Procedures approved by the Board of Trustees on June 27, 1968".

COMM-4 "A whole paragraph was added."

CHANGE 2.22 The discussions will be private and all matters presented will be held in confidence by all parties involved except that the matters discussed may be presented at subsequent hearings. BUT AT NO TIME SHALL ANY OF THE PERSONS DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE CASE OR ANY OTHER PERSONS USE THE FACT OF SUCH INFORMAL DISCUSSION, THE FACT THAT A GRIEVANCE HAS BEEN FILED, OR THE CHARACTER OF THE INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS FOR THE PURPOSE OF STRENGTHENING THE CASE FOR OR AGAINST PERSONS DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE DISPUTE OR FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE OTHER THAN THE SETTLEMENT OF THE GRIEVANCE.

OGC-5 "In subparagraph 2.31, indicate that the official form appears on the reverse side of page 5."

COMM-5 "We... deleted several words and added additional sentences."

CHANGE 2.3 FORMAL GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES
2.31 If the problem has not been resolved by means of informal discussion as outlined in 2.2, the faculty member may file a formal grievance. THE GRIEVANCE SHALL BE FILED NO LATER THAN ONE YEAR AFTER THE GRIEVANT LEARNS OF THE OCCURRENCE OF THE ACT GIVING RISE TO THE GRIEVANCE. FOR ANY REQUESTS RECEIVED AFTER APRIL 30, IF ACCEPTED FOR A HEARING, THE BEGINNING OF THE HEARING MAY, AT THE COMMITTEE'S DISCRETION, BE SCHEDULED EARLY IN THE FALL TERM. The grievance shall be fully defined and documented in writing on the official form, FACULTY GRIEVANCE FORM, and shall be presented in the following sequence as necessary:

OGC-6 "... a time limit within which the subcommittee must be appointed should be added to subparagraph 2.342."

COMM-6 "We changed 2.342 to 2.341 because there was no 2.341 and added a short phrase."

OGC-7 In subsection (6) of subparagraph 2.342, reference is made to the nonadmissibility of hearsay evidence. The concept of hearsay and the exceptions to the hearsay rule, as this rule is understood in the California courts, is a difficult one.
Rather than bring such a complex area of the law into what otherwise should be a relatively simply proceeding, if any limitation at all is desirable, we would suggest that it simply be that:

"Any relevant evidence shall be admitted if it is the sort of evidence on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs, regardless of the existence of any common law or statutory rule which might make improper the admission of such evidence over objection in civil actions. Hearsay evidence may be used for the purpose of supplementing or explaining any direct evidence but shall not be sufficient in itself to support a finding unless it would be admissible over objection in civil actions."

This is the formulation used in the administrative procedure act (Government Code Section 11513).

COMM-7 "We complied....by adding a portion...."

OGC-8 8. In subsection (12) of Section 2.342, reference is made to a transcribed record to be made by either party. Since the party preparing the record would have the self-serving job of editing the transcript, it would seem that all kinds of problems could be caused the college by such a rule. We would suggest instead that a member of the subcommittee or a stenographer assigned to the subcommittee keep a record (which need not be verbatim), or, more simply, that a tape recording be made of the grievance proceedings, with the tapes to remain in the custody of the president or of the chairman of the Grievance Committee.

COMM-8 "....removing item 12.......and substituting a new paragraph.......satisfy(s) this section."

CHANGE 2.341 If the ad hoc committee decides there are grounds for grievance, the chairman of the Grievance Committee will, WITHIN 5 DAYS, appoint a sub-committee to hear and investigate the grievance. The following general principles and procedures will apply and except by mutual consent of the grievant and the sub-committee, the total time for hearing the grievance shall be limited to 20 days.

(1) The grievant shall have the right to assistance by persons of his own choice and may designate one of these persons as spokesman in presenting his case. Also, "persons directly involved" in the grievance have the same right.

(2) The sub-committee may have present such assistance as it deems necessary. The sub-committee may also ask questions, call additional witnesses, or seek additional information.

(3) Except as permitted in (4) below, the proceedings at all levels shall be open only to the grievant, "persons directly involved," their representatives, and to persons presenting information to the sub-committee while they are presenting such information or being questioned before the sub-committee concerning such information; and all matters presented shall be held in confidence by all parties and persons present.

(4) The grievant and "persons directly involved" may request that the sub-committee permit an observer(s) to be present, except that the entire proceeding shall be closed if requested in advance by the grievant.

(5) At any point in the proceedings prior to the time at which the sub-committee meets to consider its decision, the grievant may withdraw the grievance in writing with the consent of the sub-committee.
(6) In these proceedings, the technical rules of evidence and customary court procedures are not binding; however, every effort should be made to insure a fair hearing by disallowing hearsay and other unsupported evidence. BASED ON DIRECT SUPPORTED EVIDENCE, ANY RELEVANT EVIDENCE SHALL BE ADMITTED IF IT IS THE SORT OF EVIDENCE ON WHICH RESPONSIBLE PERSONS ARE ACCUSTOMED TO RELY IN THE CONDUCT OF SERIOUS AFFAIRS.

(7) Testimony will not be taken under oath.

(8) The grievant and "persons directly involved" in the grievance and their representatives may all present statements and ask questions of each other and the witnesses.

(9) The grievant and "persons directly involved" will be permitted to present their case as they deem necessary.

(10) The grievant and "persons directly involved" shall furnish the sub-committee with a list of witnesses they wish to have called. The sub-committee shall call all witnesses; however, the sub-committee chairman may limit the calling of witnesses, and the submittal of evidence subject to the wishes of the majority of the sub-committee.

(11) In reaching its decision, the sub-committee shall not consider or review any document or other material to which the parties to the grievance are not afforded access with ample time for response.

(12) A transcribed record of the proceedings may be made by either party providing the transcript is made available at ease to the other party and sub-committee if requested.


OGC-9 ".....a time limit should be placed on the period during which the President must reach a decision in each case."

COMM-9 "We deleted a sentence.....and added a time limit...."

CHANGE 2.4 COMMITTEE REPORT AND APPEAL

2.4.1 The sub-committee shall make its report, with recommendations for settlement of the case, to the President of the College, with copies to the grievant and "persons directly involved" in the grievance within ten days after the conclusion of the hearings. The decisions of the President in each case are final on each campus. The decision of the President, THE DECISIONS OF THE PRESIDENT SHALL BE MADE WITHIN TEN DAYS OF THE RECEIPT OF THE REPORT AND except in rare instances and for compelling reasons, shall concur with the judgment of the sub-committee. In the event that the President's decision is not in accord with the sub-committee's judgment, the compelling reasons for his decision shall be stated in writing to the grievant and to the sub-committee. THE DECISION OF THE PRESIDENT ON EACH CASE IS FINAL AT THE CAMPUS LEVEL.
OGC-10 "...the implementation date set out in subsection 3.1 should be precised by deleting the last six words."

COMM-10 "We deleted the six words...."

CHANGE 3. EFFECTIVE DATE, COMMITTEE COMPOSITION, JURISDICTION

3.1 The provisions of these procedures shall be effective at the beginning of the Spring Quarter, 1969 as seems thereafter as feasible.

OGC-11 11. A grievance procedure is initiated by the person aggrieved. A disciplinary procedure is initiated by or on behalf of the president of a state college for one of the causes listed in Education Code Section 24306. Given these definitions, it is obvious that no such creature as a "disciplinary grievance" as discussed in subsection 3.3, exists.

COMM-11 "We complied....by deleting several words and correcting a statement...."

CHANGE 3.3 These grievance procedures shall include disciplinary BE APPLICABLE TO grievances ARISING FROM DISCIPLINARY CASES (such as dismissal, suspension, and demotion) until such time as separate or specific DISCIPLINARY procedures may be established.

OGC-12 ".....set a time limit as to when one may initiate a grievance proceeding."

COMM-12 "We complied....by setting a time limit of one year....in section 2.31.

CHANGE 2.31 appears after COMM-5 above.

OGC-13 ".....provide that Faculty Grievance Committee may establish such other rules, within the guidelines of the parent document, as are necessary."

COMM-13 We took no action on number 13 because we believed that the Grievance Committee could make suggested changes to the Academic Senate when they find it necessary and the committee thought trying to provide flexibility could possibly lead to abuse of these rules. In Section 2.31 the committee added FOR ANY REQUESTS RECEIVED AFTER APRIL 30, IF ACCEPTED FOR A HEARING, THE BEGINNING OF THE HEARING MAY, AT THE COMMITTEE'S DISCRETION BE SCHEDULED EARLY IN THE FALL TERM. This was done to relieve part of the overload that could occur, and did occur, last year when the grievances had to be heard after April 15 through until June.

4.0 Request for Approval
The faculty Grievance Committee requests that the Academic Senate approve these changes and inform the President, requesting Administrative Bulletin 69-1 be revised accordingly.

Leo Sankoff, Chairman
Faculty Grievance Committee
RECOMMENDATION FOR GRADING STUDY

The Instruction Committee believes that the proposals which have been brought to it for modifying the grading system should be examined in the broader context of the philosophical issues of grading as a system of evaluation of the learning process. As a preparation for considering changes in the grading system the Committee feels the need for statistical and comparative information in such areas as the following:

1. Persistence of first-time freshmen who entered in fall, 1965, and who could have graduated in June, 1969.

2. Data which would help answer the following question: Is there a change in the grade distribution since higher admission standards were imposed in 1965? Are more A's and B's being given now and less D's and F's?

3. The grade distribution in each quarter sequence of selected year-long courses. It would be interesting to know what happened to the students who received the A's, B's, and C's in the fall quarter. Did they continue to get about the same grades as the course continued throughout the year? Or, conversely, was a fixed grade distribution (such as 10% A, 20% B) applied to the students regardless of their prior achievement? Did the survivors have to compete against fellow survivors?

4. Comparative data from California State Polytechnic College, Pomona. It would be helpful if we could exchange research problems and data, desirably by major.

5. Comparative data from the California State Colleges as a collective group.

6. Comparative data from national studies.

7. Any data available on the correlation of college grades with later success in employment, teacher-training programs, or graduate study.

8. Any study that may be available regarding the relative effectiveness of grading systems on student motivation and morale.

After such information is available we will be in a better position to decide what action or further study would be beneficial. Specifically, only with data would it be fruitful to study issues like the following:

Attachment III-a
Academic Senate
Agenda June 3, 1969
1. Grading "on the Curve" presumes a class made up of a representative sample of students. What effect has a higher admission standard had upon this presumption?

2. Can an absolute standard of achievement at a fixed level of performance be implemented (for example, by using nationally standardized tests in subject fields)?

3. Are present grading practices unfairly penalizing students in certain majors or schools? Can grading guidelines be prepared to suggest more equal treatment of students in different areas?

Recommendation:

The Academic Senate recommends to the President that he authorize the compilation of an institutional studies report, to be completed by January 1, 1970, to provide the necessary information for a general reconsideration of the grading philosophy, methods, and policies of the College.
VIDEOTAPE RECORDER FOR FACULTY SELF-EVALUATION GUIDELINES

With the assumption that a videotape recorded system for faculty self-evaluation only will be operational in the 1969-70 academic year, the following guidelines are recommended for adoption.

A. Guidelines

1. Faculty participation in VTR self-evaluation shall be voluntary.

2. Each faculty member shall have the right to limit replay of his recorded tape to himself during the available time period before erasure of the tape.

3. Initial operation shall be on an experimental basis, with a subcommittee of the Academic Senate Instruction Committee formed as a VTR study group to: (a) develop systematic methods of self-evaluation, techniques of use, demonstrations and instructions for other faculty; (b) work with A-V Services to develop patterns of scheduling and operation within the limits of the equipment, tape, technical staff and facilities; (c) recommend future development with operational, administrative, and budgetary requirements.

4. Custody of equipment and technical control shall be in A-V Services, with an A-V representative in the VTR study group.

5. After an initial experimental phase by the VTR study group, the VTR system shall be available on a scheduled basis with demonstrations and instructions handled by the VTR study group.

B. Recommendations

Looking ahead—Experience in 1969-70 should indicate future policies and budget needs for equipment, materials, staff and facilities for videotape recording and improvement of instruction.

It is, however, already evident to make most efficient use of faculty time and VTR equipment time, that a second videotape recorder is needed to play back tapes in some location other than the one in which the recording is made.

It also appears that for effective training and counseling in VTR use, faculty released time or part of an additional professional position will be required.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Rod Keif, Chairman
    Academic Senate

FROM: Instruction Committee

SUBJECT: Proposal for Credit--No Credit Grading Option

A proposal for a Pass--No Pass grading option was approved by the Student
Affairs Council February 11, 1969, forwarded by A.S.I. President to the President
of the College April 8, 1969, forwarded by the President of the College to the
Academic Senate April 10, 1969, and was received by the Instruction Committee
April 29, 1969.

Rick Hayden, chairman of the student committee which prepared the proposal
over a two-year period, presented to the committee an extensive summary of
experience with Pass--Fail, Credit--No Credit, etc., grading provisions at other
institutions. This material included correspondence with a large number of
other institutions, including California State Colleges, University of California
campuses, and other institutions across the country, as well as some detailed
studies of the results with such grading procedures at certain institutions.
These institutions, while admitting some problems, generally reported very favor­
ably. Some evidence was presented that students in Pass--No Pass courses often
do work at levels comparable in quality with those in conventionally graded
courses (i.e., A and B students tended to do A and B work even when they were
not competing for letter grades).

The Instruction Committee has endeavored to give the proposal wide circulation
among the faculty through the Cal Poly Report and through a news item in the
Mustang, both announcing an Instruction Committee meeting on the proposal.

The following paragraph is the student declaration of the objective of what
they recommended as a Pass--No Pass grading option. The Instruction Committee
prefers to use the terms Credit--No Credit, mainly because all California junior
colleges must use these terms.

"This option is designed to encourage students in good standing to venture
into courses which they might otherwise hesitate to take because they are
uncertain about their aptitude or preparation. Up to now there has gener­
ally been more emphasis on grades than on education. Students are more
likely to avoid courses which would develop them as persons, but might
endanger their grade point averages. The present audit grade does not
indicate that the student has obtained even minimal knowledge of the course
material."

ATTACHMENT III-c-1
The Academic Senate recommends that the President endorse the following policy on Credit--No Credit grading:

Policy on Credit--No Credit Grading

1. Only one Credit--No Credit course may be taken each quarter.

2. The Credit--No Credit system is open to freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors.

3. The student must enroll for either Credit--No Credit or conventional letter grading (ABCDF) at registration and may not change from one system to the other after the end of the normal no-penalty withdrawal date of the quarter.

4. Students will be given a grade of Credit for accomplishment equivalent to a C or better. No Credit will be given for accomplishment equivalent to D or F levels. Instructors will give conventional letter grades which will be converted to Credit--No Credit by the Registrar's office.

5. Courses in the student's major (designated with the M on the curriculum sheet) may not be taken for Credit--No Credit grading.

6. Instructors may give highest priority to students who must take certain courses for graduation. If the Credit--No Credit system adversely affects the availability of space or of other resources, this aspect of the policy should be promptly reconsidered.

7. Units earned in courses for which the grade was Credit will count toward satisfaction of units needed for a degree.

8. Grades of Credit or No Credit will be disregarded in determining the student's grade point average.

9. This Credit--No Credit grading policy will be experimental during 1969-70 and 1970-71.
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO COLLEGE ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL

Section 452. Research Activities

Delete the first paragraph and insert:

"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.
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. These leaves provide for research in the broad sense including all systematic studies conducted for the expansion of knowledge in any field of learning appropriate to the function of the College and 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
   c. October 27 - School dean forwards applications with recommendations to the College Research Committee c/o Director, Research and Development, for review and action recommendation.
   h. March 27 - School dean forwards application with recommendations to the College Research Committee c/o Director, Research and Development, for review and action recommendation.

3. Eligibility
   In the first sentence, after the word "Only" insert "full-time".

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.
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POLICY AND PROCEDURES CONCERNING OVERHEAD FUNDS
ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

1. Introduction

Overhead, or indirect costs, as distinguished from direct costs, are those which are not entirely identifiable to the costs of carrying on a specific program. Overhead funds develop as 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 support for the specific project under which they were reimbursed.

2. Policy for Seeking Overhead Funds

The college shall seek overhead funds for each research and development project whether administered through the State of California or the California State Polytechnic College Foundation. The overhead 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 Overhead 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 overhead 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 overhead costs, the respective business offices may utilize a proportionate share of their estimates for the administration of the projects.

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

4. Procedure for Utilization

A. At the beginning of a fiscal year the Director, Research and Development, shall report the income from indirect costs from all projects.

B. The Director, Research and Development, shall develop an indirect costs income and expenditure proposal which shall include the following:
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1. Income, including any balances of unused overhead from the previous year remaining in the Overhead Trust Accounts.

2. Costs of financial administration.


4. Estimated funds needed for postaudit purposes.

5. 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 Overhead Funds

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

   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 develop the necessary application forms and procedures for an award system. Final approval of College Research Committee recommendations will rest with the Academic Vice President and President.
PATENT POLICY

PREAMBLE

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 members of the faculty and employees 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 faculty member or an employee 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.

Therefore, 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.

POLICY

A. Patentable research and invention resulting from research in the College through support by public or private funds shall be reported to the College Research Committee which is advisory to the Academic Vice President of the College.

B. The Research Committee will expedite an investigation of the research work for patent possibilities and shall submit its report as promptly as possible to the President of the College. Such reports should specifically recommend whether or not a patent should be sought and should recommend a tentative allocation of net profits to the research worker.

C. If the results of a particular research are such as to warrant patenting, the College will require academic and non-academic members to assign their
rights to the California State Polytechnic College Foundation, with the understanding that the academic or non-academic members will participate in the net profits derived from the exploitation of the patent. The California State Polytechnic College Foundation shall expedite the securing of patents and arrange for the issuance of licenses to promote the use of inventions. The Foundation may wish to assign inventions to a patenting corporation, in which case royalties are limited to a percentage of gross receipts.

D. Research work financed wholly or in part by an outside sponsor comes under the special provisions of the contract covering such work. Faculty and staff members 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 a faculty member on his own time and without the use of College facilities, may be voluntarily submitted by the faculty member 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 a 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 and at his own expense.
TO  Rod Keif, Chmn., Academic Senate

Fax: Ad hoc Committee on Academic Structure and Organization

S U B J E C T  Progress Report

1. Tentative time table of work
   a. May - formation of committee, request for input from interested faculty, report of progress to the Academic Senate,
   b. June, July, August - continuation of committee study as committee members are available, continued input of suggestions.
   c. September, October - formulation of a suggested plan of organization, hearings on proposed report.
   d. October, November - report to Academic Senate and, if endorsed in substantial respects, submitted to the President in time for inclusion in 1970-71 catalog copy (as amended and if approved by the President).

2. Tentative list of factors to be considered
   a. Any changes in the present alignment of schools and departments can be justified only on the basis of improved instruction.
   b. At present there is no magic formula for the determination of what should be or should not be a school, division, or department.
   c. A school should or division should be composed of compatible, supporting, and affinitive programs in so far as possible.
   d. The wishes of those concerned should be considered - the moved group and its majors, the receiving group and its majors.
   e. The present scheduling and planning in existing departments on the policy of the 40/60% principle should be retained inviolate, at least pending the solution of this problem as a college-wide policy.
   f. If a new school and/or division is created, the leadership must be determined through the established policies of consultation; this, however, does not preclude the necessary appointment of acting leadership until a permanent choice is approved.
   g. The fact that a sub-discipline is removed from an existing department does not ipso facto justify its status as a department; it may well be better to retain it as a sub-discipline in another department until departmental status can be justified, recommended, and approved.
   h. The fact that a new department is recommended does not automatically justify its establishment of a major program; each must be pursued through normal procedures.

3. Members of the committee (Warren R. Anderson, William H. Brown, Arvon I. Roast, Logan S. Carter, Charles H. Hewton, Dale H. Andrews, and David Grant, Chmn.) request the continued input of suggestions and ideas which will be of help during their summer committee work. A representative of IST will be added during the summer meetings.
TO: Rod Keif, Chair, Academic Senate
FROM: Faculty Personnel Committee
SUBJECT: End of Year Report, 1968-69

June 3, 1969

During the academic year the Faculty Personnel Committee performed its responsibilities under the Constitution and By-laws of the Faculty-Staff Council and later in the year under the Constitution and By-laws of the Academic Senate, but with a membership continuing throughout the year. Members of the committee were: Ernest Bloom, Robert Frost, Walter Holtz, C. L. Graves, G. L. Gregory, and Dave Grant, Chair. Warren Burgess, ASI President, met with the committee during the last three meetings.

The committee fulfilled its responsibilities in reviewing personnel matters relating to stockings, retention, tenure, reappointment, relocation, and promotion and submitted its reports to the specified college officers.

In the committee's reports of April 14 and April 22 to President Kennedy, the committee pointed out certain problems and questions which it had encountered. The committee indicated that it would ask that these questions and problems be referred to the Personnel Policy Committee of the Academic Senate for review and recommendation.

These are the items:

1. Should an instructor on leave with pay be evaluated and considered for promotion if eligible?
2. What is going to be the effect of the limitation of the 40/60 policy on the college, particularly in the Schools of Engineering and Agriculture?
3. When an instructor is hired and there are special conditions on commitments, should such information be in written form? To what extent and for how long such such agreements be binding?
4. Should all departments set up guidelines or criteria for promotion, especially into the senior and principal ranks? When a department attempts to upgrade its standards, what will be the effect upon instructors who have been hired under older and less demanding requirements?
5. Should promotion be recommended before tenure has been attained or recommended? Is a college-wide policy desirable or is it better left to the department?
6. Who should govern the application of the 40/60 limitation? The dean, department head, committee? The department members?
7. Is more uniformity desirable in the departmental procedures for recommending tenure, reappointment, and promotion? If so, to what extent or within what limits?
8. Is there any solution to give every eligible instructor equal opportunity to be recommended to senior instructor on his own merits and ability, regardless of that school or department in which teaching is?

It is recommended that these questions be referred to the Personnel Policy Committee for study and recommendation.