I. Minutes: Approval of Academic Senate minutes for the meetings of February 28 and March 6 2012 (pp. 2-5).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Regular Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost:
D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
E. Statewide Senate:
F. CFA:
G. ASI:

IV. Consent Agenda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name or Course Number, Title</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate (AS)</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIST 350 The Scientific Revolution, c. 1500-1800 (4), 4 lectures, GE D5</td>
<td>Recommended for approval upon receipt of consulting memos 2/9/12; consulting memos received 2/22/12</td>
<td>Placed on 4/10/12 consent agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Business Item(s):
A. Election of 2012-13 Senate Chair and Vice Chair.
B. Resolution on Shared Governance: Ken Brown, representative for Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading (pp. 6-13). [See attached e-copy of “Shared Governance Reconsidered.” This is background material for the resolution. Before printing, please note it is 52 pages. A copy does not need to be brought to the meeting].
C. Resolution on For Profit Course Material Sites: ExecCom, first reading (pp. 14-16).

VI. Special Reports:
B. [TIME CERTAIN 4:35] Kevin Bontenbal, Academic Senate President of Cuesta College: Cuesta College accreditation process (pp. 21-22).

VII. Adjournment:
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
Tuesday, February 28, 2012
UU220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Special Reports: Ruth Black, CSU Online Director – reported that the program has been renamed Cal State Online in order to avoid confusion with other programs such as Colorado State University and Cleveland South University. Black began her report by stating that the Katz report focused on over 50 ideas that could have been incorporated into Cal State Online, including the contentious idea of the 24th campus. The initial work of Cal State Online is to focus on the 60 or so self-supported programs already offered online. Those programs have been invited to consider participating in Cal State Online. A goal for Cal State Online at this time is to centralize some key functions to support online programs, such as compliance with state regulations in order to minimized the regulatory concern of individual campuses. Another area of focus is the creation of a few programs at the undergraduate level for degree completion opportunity for students. CSU Reconnect, as this program is being called, is being proposed by Northridge Liberal Studies faculty, and is for students who have been separated from their studies for at least 15 months but less than 6 years and have at least 80 transferable units. The goal of CSU Reconnect is to provide an accelerated path to graduation. Another item from the Katz report that is being considered is the idea of a CSU online early start program for students who need early start work in order to be ready for either entry as a freshman or a transfer student. All these areas of work, ideas, and goals can take many years. Cal State Online does not nor will it ever receive state funds. The startup funding came from $50,000 given by each campus as seed money. Cal State Online does not have a proposal to offer full 120 unit undergraduate degrees or comprehensive general education classes. At this time, much of the work and discussions are about the options for securing funding.

II. Minutes: The minutes of February 7, 2012 were approved as presented.

III. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none.

IV. Consent Agenda: BUS 301 – Global Financial Institutions and Markets was approved.

V. Business Item(s):
   A. Resolution on General Education C5 Elective (GE Governance Board): Machamer presented this resolution, which requests that the Academic Senate approve the proposal for a defined C5 Elective Area for majors within CAFES, CAED, CSM, and OCOB, which would allow students to receive GE credit for intermediate courses in language other than English that have a substantial cultural component beginning with the 2013-2015 catalog. M/S/P to approve the resolution.
   B. Resolution on Academic Senate Executive Committee Attendance and Voting Provision (Executive Committee): Fernflores presented this resolution, which allows the college caucus to designate a substitute to serve on the Executive Committee. M/S/P to approve the resolution.
C. **Resolution on Support and Commendation for President Armstrong’s Defense of Academic Freedom (Executive Committee):** Foroozar presented this resolution requesting the commendation of President Armstrong for his strong leadership in protecting the core principles of academic freedom. Resolution will return as a second reading item.

D. **Resolution on Concentration Definition (Curriculum Committee):** Schaffner presented this resolution, which revises the definition of concentrations on CAM beginning with the 2013-2015 catalog. Resolution will return as a second reading item.

VI. Regular Reports:
A. **Academic Senate Chair:** Femflores reported that Lieutenant Governor Newsom met with a small group of students and toured Cal Poly last Friday. Trustee Margaret Fortune is scheduled to visit Cal Poly on April 11, followed by Faculty Trustee Bernadette Cheyne, and student trustee in May. In addition, the WASC visiting team will be on campus April 3-5 and will meet with the Executive Committee.

B. **President’s Office:** Kinsley reported that the Student Success Fee Referendum vote will take place on Wednesday, February 29 and the results will be available Thursday, May 1, 2012.

C. **Provost:** Enz Finken reported that admission notices started to go out last week. Enrollment for 2012-2013 will remain at 16,000 FTEs. Currently the number of students admitted is about 2% below target. Jim Maraviglia, Assoc Vice Prov Marketing & Enrollment Development has noted that as Cal Poly becomes more competitive, the percentage of students who actually accept has gone down. This is due to the students having options from other institutions. There is a lot of discussion going on at all levels about the budget, strategic planning both campus wide and academic affairs, continuing education, IT and IT security, fall conference, international issues, and much more.

D. **Vice Provost for Student Affairs:** Allen reported that this past weekend student government brought together 75 years of past student leaders. The Rec Center is seeing about 4,500 students a day. Career Services collaborated with the Economic Vitality Committee to host a local job fair, which was very well received.

E. **Statewide Senate:** LoCascio reported that trustee chair Herbert Carter was not renewed as trustee. Robert Linscheid from Chico will serve as chair.

F. **CFA Campus President:** none.

G. **ASI Representative:** Titus reported about the networking opportunity provided by having student leaders from the last 75 years on campus.

VII. Adjournment: 5:00 pm

Submitted by,

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
I. Minutes: none.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: Femflores reported that many Academic Senate and University Committees still have vacancies for the 2012-2013 academic year. Academic Senate and Executive agendas now include bookmarks in order to facilitate finding different parts of the document.
B. President’s Office: Kinsley reported that 7,622 students participated in the Student Success Fee advisory vote with 57% voting in favor and 43% opposing the fee increase. President Armstrong is evaluating the vote as well as formal endorsements of support and opposition submitted by recognized students groups.
C. Provost: Enz Finken reported that ongoing conversations with many campus groups revolve around the issue of orientation or workshops for professional development of department chairs/heads, the schedule for fall conference, and whether the activities serve the needs of students, faculty, and staff. In addition, at the last Deans Council meeting, the summer budget and ways to create a better budget model were discussed.
D. Vice Provost for Student Affairs: Allen reported that Cal Poly is working with the students displaced by the recent house fire. All the students are fine but they have lost everything. Donations are being accepted.
E. Statewide Senate: none.
F. CFA Campus President: none.
G. ASI Representative: none.

IV. Consent Agenda: ARCE 260 – History of Structures was approved.

V. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Support and Commendation for President Armstrong’s Defense of Academic Freedom (Executive Committee): Foroozar presented this resolution requesting the commendation of President Armstrong for his strong leadership in protecting the core principles of academic freedom. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

B. Resolution on Concentration Definition (Curriculum Committee): Schaffner presented this resolution, which revises the definition of concentrations on CAM beginning with the 2013-2015 catalog. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

VI. Special Reports:
A. Marisa Ramirez, Digital Repository Librarian: demonstration for viewing Academic Senate documents now stored on DigitalCommons. DigitalCommons is the university online archive based out of the Kennedy Library, which offers faculty the opportunity to place their scholarship online, as well as housing senior projects, posters, thesis, etc. DigitalCommons will digitize the Academic Senate’s agendas, minutes, and resolutions from 1968 to the present. Every item is assigned a persistent URL so there is no link breakage and it is easy to cite.
You can find the Academic Senate information at: http://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/academicsenate/
If you are interested in getting your scholarship online or if you want to discuss publishing historical items such as publications and newsletters, please contact Marisa Ramirez at mramir14@calpoly.edu.

B. **Brian Tietje, Dean for Continuing Education:** update on summer quarter.
Summer 2011 was successful and we hope that summer 2012 continues to attract students and provide them with options to make progress to degree. The primary rule about summer running through continuing education is that it is financially self-supported. Faculty compensation plan is based on the site agreement for collective bargaining with CFA, therefore the current compensation plan is in effect until a new contract agreement is reached. Stipends are being offered to faculty who wish to convert their courses to online or hybrid courses. Continuing Education has had great success in working on refining the agreement with the faculty on the online component, making sure that everybody’s rights as it relates to the content is protected. Summer 2012 will consist of one 8-week term. This year, a flat per unit fee of $289 has been approved, which is more in line with the self-support model. A marketing campaign is planned with TV, print, radio, and newspaper ads. Included in the marketing campaign will be a series of emails to super seniors and students on academic probation as well as distinct emails to junior and seniors.

C. **David Conn, AVP for Institutional Review:** veterans support group.
A task force was established last summer to look at the needs of student veterans and student dependents of veterans on campus. The need arose after a student veteran complained about how he was treated and the services available to him. Almost simultaneously, in August there was a publication of the CSU Student Veteran Research Project based on research done on all 23 CSU campuses to see how veterans are being treated. Campuses were scored on seven criteria and with the exception of one criteria, Cal Poly was last on all of them. A subcommittee comprised of student veterans, faculty, and staff developed a SurveyGizmo survey. The survey was sent to 381 recipients with 35 student veterans and 62 student dependents of veterans responding. The survey revealed that the needs of veterans and dependents differ greatly and include items such as the need for a single website as a point of contact for on-and-off campus resources, mentoring, access to designated Cal Poly employees, etc.

D. **Kevin Lertwachara, chair of the Instruction Committee and Teri Bruns, ITS Collaboration Support:** Class aliases – management, use and misuse of distribution lists
The way class aliases are currently set up, anyone can utilize them to send emails. The Instruction Committee discussed the problem with students who are using the class aliases to send class notes and other unauthorized material. Right now, the Instruction Committee is looking at changing the default settings for class alias, so that the faculty member is the only ones who can send emails to their class. ITS is recommending that we wait until fall 2012 to make the change.

VII. Adjournment: 5:00 pm

Submitted by,

[Signature]

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
WHEREAS, One of the key tenets of quality higher education is shared governance in which responsibility for the running of the university is shared by faculty, staff, students, administrators, and trustees; and

WHEREAS, The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) “Statement on Governance of Colleges and Universities” 1990 and Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) “Shared Governance Reconsidered: Improving Decision-Making in the California State University” 2001 characterize the best practices of shared governance; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly has a long history of participation in shared governance; and

WHEREAS, Our new President, Provost, along with various other new higher administrators and Deans newly or soon to be hired may be unfamiliar with the implementation of shared governance at Cal Poly, and

WHEREAS, The faculty, for their own sake, also have an interest in explicitly articulating what shared governance means at Cal Poly; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The faculty affirm its primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and student educational processes; and be it further

RESOLVED: On matters wherein faculty has primary responsibility, decisions of trustees and the President should concur with faculty judgment except in rare circumstances, and for reasons clearly communicated to the faculty; and be it further

RESOLVED: The faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the trustees or president; and be it further

RESOLVED: The faculty should strive to apply the model of shared governance detailed in Appendix C of the ASCSU report in The Constitution of the Faculty and the Bylaws Of The Academic Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate propose to revise amend the preamble to the Constitution of the Faculty to include shared governance in the definition of the functions of the Academic Senate as follows:

We, the faculty of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, in order to meet our academic responsibilities, hereby establish this Constitution of the Faculty for our governance. The responsibilities of the faculty, the powers
necessary to fulfill those responsibilities, and the collegial form of shared governance are based on historic academic traditions that have been recognized by the people of the State of California through their legislature.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: March 13, 2012
Revised: March 20, 2012
Revised: March 30, 2012
Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities

The statement that follows is directed to governing board members, administrators, faculty members, students, and other persons in the belief that the colleges and universities of the United States have reached a stage calling for appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action among the components of the academic institution. The statement is intended to foster constructive joint thought and action, both within the institutional structure and in protection of its integrity against improper intrusions.

It is not intended that the statement serve as a blueprint for governance on a specific campus or as a manual for the regulation of controversy among the components of an academic institution, although it is to be hoped that the principles asserted will lead to the correction of existing weaknesses and assist in the establishment of sound structures and procedures. The statement does not attempt to cover relations with those outside agencies that increasingly are controlling the resources and influencing the patterns of education in our institutions of higher learning: for example, the United States government, state legislatures, state commissions, interstate associations or compacts, and other interinstitutional arrangements. However, it is hoped that the statement will be helpful to these agencies in their consideration of educational matters.

Students are referred to in this statement as an institutional component coordinate in importance with trustees, administrators, and faculty. There is, however, no main section on students. The omission has two causes: (1) the changes now occurring in the status of American students have plainly outdistanced the analysis by the educational community, and an attempt to define the situation without thorough study might prove unfair to student interests, and (2) students do not in fact at present have a significant voice in the government of colleges and universities; it would be unseemly to obscure, by superficial equality of length of statement, what may be a serious lag entitled to separate and full confrontation. The concern for student status felt by the organizations issuing this statement is embodied in a note, "On Student Status," intended to stimulate the educational community to turn its attention to an important need.

This statement was jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). In October 1966, the board of directors of the ACE took action by which its council "recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations," and "commends it to the organizations which are members of the Council." The Council of the AAUP adopted the statement in October 1966, and the Fifty-third Annual Meeting endorsed it in April 1967. In November 1966, the executive committee of the AGB took action by which that organization also "recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations," and "commends it to the governing boards which are members of the Association." (In April 1990, the Council of the AAUP adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.)

1. Introduction
This statement is a call to mutual understanding regarding the government of colleges and universities. Understanding, based on community of interest and producing joint effort, is essential for at least three reasons. First, the academic institution, public or private, often has become less autonomous; buildings, research, and student tuition are supported by funds over which the college or university exercises a diminishing control. Legislative and executive governmental authorities, at all levels, play a part in the making of important decisions in academic policy. If these voices and forces are to be successfully heard and integrated, the academic institution must be in a position to meet them with its own generally unified view. Second, regard
for the welfare of the institution remains important despite the mobility and interchange of scholars. Third, a college or university in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems.

2. The Academic Institution: Joint Effort

a. Preliminary Considerations. The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.

Joint effort in an academic institution will take a variety of forms appropriate to the kinds of situations encountered. In some instances, an initial exploration or recommendation will be made by the president with consideration by the faculty at a later stage; in other instances, a first and essentially definitive recommendation will be made by the faculty, subject to the endorsement of the president and the governing board. In still others, a substantive contribution can be made when student leaders are responsibly involved in the process. Although the variety of such approaches may be wide, at least two general conclusions regarding joint effort seem clearly warranted: (1) important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all the institutional components, and (2) differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand, as developed hereinafter.

b. Determination of General Educational Policy. The general educational policy, i.e., the objectives of an institution and the nature, range, and pace of its efforts, is shaped by the institutional charter or by law, by tradition and historical development, by the present needs of the community of the institution, and by the professional aspirations and standards of those directly involved in its work. Every board will wish to go beyond its formal trustee obligation to conserve the accomplishment of the past and to engage seriously with the future; every faculty will seek to conduct an operation worthy of scholarly standards of learning; every administrative officer will strive to meet his or her charge and to attain the goals of the institution. The interests of all are coordinate and related, and unilateral effort can lead to confusion or conflict. Essential to a solution is a reasonably explicit statement on general educational policy. Operating responsibility and authority, and procedures for continuing review, should be clearly defined in official regulations.

When an educational goal has been established, it becomes the responsibility primarily of the faculty to determine the appropriate curriculum and procedures of student instruction.

Special considerations may require particular accommodations: (1) a publicly supported institution may be regulated by statutory provisions, and (2) a church-controlled institution may be limited by its charter or bylaws. When such external requirements influence course content and the manner of instruction or research, they impair the educational effectiveness of the institution.

Such matters as major changes in the size or composition of the student body and the relative emphasis to be given to the various elements of the educational and research program should involve participation of governing board, administration, and faculty prior to final decision.

c. Internal Operations of the Institution. The framing and execution of long-range plans, one of the most important aspects of institutional responsibility, should be a central and continuing concern in the academic community.

Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college or uni-
versity. The channels of communication should be established and maintained by joint endeavor. Distinction should be observed between the institutional system of communication and the system of responsibility for the making of decisions.

A second area calling for joint effort in internal operation is that of decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources. The board, president, and faculty should all seek agreement on basic decisions regarding buildings and other facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution.

A third area is budgeting. The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing board, in the administrative authority of the president, and in the educational function of the faculty. Each component should therefore have a voice in the determination of short- and long-range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short- and long-range budgetary projections. The function of each component in budgetary matters should be understood by all; the allocation of authority will determine the flow of information and the scope of participation in decisions.

Joint effort of a most critical kind must be taken when an institution chooses a new president. The selection of a chief administrative officer should follow upon a cooperative search by the governing board and the faculty, taking into consideration the opinions of others who are appropriately interested. The president should be equally qualified to serve both as the executive officer of the governing board and as the chief academic officer of the institution and the faculty. The president's dual role requires an ability to interpret to board and faculty the educational views and concepts of institutional government of the other. The president should have the confidence of the board and the faculty.

The selection of academic deans and other chief academic officers should be the responsibility of the president with the advice of, and in consultation with, the appropriate faculty.

Determinations of faculty status, normally based on the recommendations of the faculty groups involved, are discussed in Part 5 of this statement; but it should here be noted that the building of a strong faculty requires careful joint effort in such actions as staff selection and promotion and the granting of tenure. Joint action should also govern dismissals; the applicable principles and procedures in these matters are well established.

\textbf{d. External Relations of the Institution.} Anyone—a member of the governing board, the president or other member of the administration, a member of the faculty, or a member of the student body or the alumni—affects the institution when speaking of it in public. An individual who speaks unofficially should so indicate. An individual who speaks officially for the institution, the board, the administration, the faculty, or the student body should be guided by established policy.

It should be noted that only the board speaks legally for the whole institution, although it may delegate responsibility to an agent.

The right of a board member, an administrative officer, a faculty member, or a student to speak on general educational questions or about the administration and operations of the individual's own institution is a part of that person's right as a citizen and should not be abridged by the institution. There exist, of course, legal bounds relating to defamation of character, and there are questions of propriety.

\section{3. The Academic Institution: The Governing Board}

The governing board has a special obligation to ensure that the history of the college or university shall serve as a prelude and inspiration to the future. The board helps relate the institution to its chief community: for example, the community college to serve the educational needs of a defined population area or group, the church-controlled college to be cognizant of the announced position of its denomination, and the comprehensive university to discharge the many duties and to accept the appropriate new challenges which are its concern at the several levels of higher education.
The governing board of an institution of higher education in the United States operates, with few exceptions, as the final institutional authority. Private institutions are established by charters; public institutions are established by constitutional or statutory provisions. In private institutions the board is frequently self-perpetuating; in public colleges and universities the present membership of a board may be asked to suggest candidates for appointment. As a whole and individually, when the governing board confronts the problem of succession, serious attention should be given to obtaining properly qualified persons. Where public law calls for election of governing board members, means should be found to ensure the nomination of fully suited persons, and the electorate should be informed of the relevant criteria for board membership.

Since the membership of the board may embrace both individual and collective competence of recognized weight, its advice or help may be sought through established channels by other components of the academic community. The governing board of an institution of higher education, while maintaining a general overview, entrusts the conduct of administration to the administrative officers—the president and the deans—and the conduct of teaching and research to the faculty. The board should undertake appropriate self-limitation.

One of the governing board’s important tasks is to ensure the publication of codified statements that define the overall policies and procedures of the institution under its jurisdiction.

The board plays a central role in relating the likely needs of the future to predictable resources; it has the responsibility for husbanding the endowment; it is responsible for obtaining needed capital and operating funds; and in the broadest sense of the term it should pay attention to personnel policy. In order to fulfill these duties, the board should be aided by, and may insist upon, the development of long-range planning by the administration and faculty. When ignorance or ill will threatens the institution or any part of it, the governing board must be available for support. In grave crises it will be expected to serve as a champion. Although the action to be taken by it will usually be on behalf of the president, the faculty, or the student body, the board should make clear that the protection it offers to an individual or a group is, in fact, a fundamental defense of the vested interests of society in the educational institution.

4. The Academic Institution: The President

The president, as the chief executive officer of an institution of higher education, is measured largely by his or her capacity for institutional leadership. The president shares responsibility for the definition and attainment of goals, for administrative action, and for operating the communications system that links the components of the academic community. The president represents the institution to its many publics. The president’s leadership role is supported by delegated authority from the board and faculty.

As the chief planning officer of an institution, the president has a special obligation to innovate and initiate. The degree to which a president can envision new horizons for the institution, and can persuade others to see them and to work toward them, will often constitute the chief measure of the president’s administration.

The president must at times, with or without support, infuse new life into a department; relatedly, the president may at times be required, working within the concept of tenure, to solve problems of obsolescence. The president will necessarily utilize the judgments of the faculty but may also, in the interest of academic standards, seek outside evaluations by scholars of acknowledged competence.

It is the duty of the president to see to it that the standards and procedures in operational use within the college or university conform to the policy established by the governing board and to the standards of sound academic practice. It is also incumbent on the president to ensure that faculty views, including dissenting views, are presented to the board in those areas and on those issues where responsibilities are shared. Similarly, the faculty should be informed of the views of the board and the administration on like issues.

The president is largely responsible for the maintenance of existing institutional resources and the creation of new resources; has ultimate managerial responsibility for a large area of nonacademic activities; is responsible for public understanding; and by the nature of the office
is the chief person who speaks for the institution. In these and other areas the president's work is to plan, to organize, to direct, and to represent. The presidential function should receive the general support of board and faculty.

5. The Academic Institution: The Faculty

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board. Budgets, personnel limitations, the time element, and the policies of other groups, bodies, and agencies having jurisdiction over the institution may set limits to realization of faculty advice.

The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degrees thus achieved.

Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

The faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.

The chair or head of a department, who serves as the chief representative of the department within an institution, should be selected either by departmental election or by appointment following consultation with members of the department and of related departments; appointments should normally be in conformity with department members' judgment. The chair or department head should not have tenure in office; tenure as a faculty member is a matter of separate right. The chair or head should serve for a stated term but without prejudice to reelection or to reappointment by procedures that involve appropriate faculty consultation. Board, administration, and faculty should all bear in mind that the department chair or head has a special obligation to build a department strong in scholarship and teaching capacity.

Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present. An agency should exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty. The structure and procedures for faculty participation should be designed, approved, and established by joint action of the components of the institution. Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty.

The agencies may consist of meetings of all faculty members of a department, school, college, division, or university system, or may take the form of faculty-elected executive committees in departments and schools and a faculty-elected senate or council for larger divisions or the institution as a whole.

The means of communication among the faculty, administration, and governing board now in use include: (1) circulation of memoranda and reports by board committees, the administration, and faculty committees; (2) joint ad hoc committees; (3) standing liaison committees; (4) membership of faculty members on administrative bodies; and (5) membership of faculty members on governing boards. Whatever the channels of communication, they should be clearly understood and observed.
On Student Status

When students in American colleges and universities desire to participate responsibly in the government of the institution they attend, their wish should be recognized as a claim to opportunity both for educational experience and for involvement in the affairs of their college or university. Ways should be found to permit significant student participation within the limits of attainable effectiveness. The obstacles to such participation are large and should not be minimized: inexperience, untested capacity, a transitory status which means that present action does not carry with it subsequent responsibility, and the inescapable fact that the other components of the institution are in a position of judgment over the students. It is important to recognize that student needs are strongly related to educational experience, both formal and informal.

Students expect, and have a right to expect, that the educational process will be structured, that they will be stimulated by it to become independent adults, and that they will have effectively transmitted to them the cultural heritage of the larger society. If institutional support is to have its fullest possible meaning, it should incorporate the strength, freshness of view, and idealism of the student body.

The respect of students for their college or university can be enhanced if they are given at least these opportunities: (1) to be listened to in the classroom without fear of institutional reprisal for the substance of their views, (2) freedom to discuss questions of institutional policy and operation, (3) the right to academic due process when charged with serious violations of institutional regulations, and (4) the same right to hear speakers of their own choice as is enjoyed by other components of the institution.

Notes

1. See the 1940 “Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure,” AAUP, Policy Documents and Reports, 10th ed. (Washington, D.C., 2006), 3-11, and the 1958 “Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings,” ibid., 12–15. These statements were jointly adopted by the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) and the American Association of University Professors; the 1940 “Statement” has been endorsed by numerous learned and scientific societies and educational associations.

2. With respect to faculty members, the 1940 “Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure” reads: “College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution” (Policy Documents and Reports, 3-4).

3. Traditionally, governing boards developed within the context of single-campus institutions. In more recent times, governing and coordinating boards have increasingly tended to develop at the multi-campus regional, systemwide, or statewide levels. As influential components of the academic community, these supra-campus bodies bear particular responsibility for protecting the autonomy of individual campuses or institutions under their jurisdiction and for implementing policies of shared responsibility. The American Association of University Professors regards the objectives and practices recommended in the “Statement on Government” as constituting equally appropriate guidelines for such supra-campus bodies, and looks toward continued development of practices that will facilitate application of such guidelines in this new context. [Preceding note adopted by the AAUP's Council in June 1978.]

4. With regard to student admissions, the faculty should have a meaningful role in establishing institutional policies, including the setting of standards for admission, and should be afforded opportunity for oversight of the entire admissions process. [Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 2002.]

5. The American Association of University Professors regards collective bargaining, properly used, as another means of achieving sound academic government. Where there is faculty collective bargaining, the parties should seek to ensure appropriate institutional governance structures which will protect the right of all faculty to participate in institutional governance in accordance with the “Statement on Government.” [Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 1978.]
WHEREAS, The number and variety of for-profit websites distributing student-uploaded course materials, including lectures notes, practice quizzes, actual quizzes and actual exams is increasing; and

WHEREAS, One such site, Course Hero, currently has materials for hundreds of Cal Poly courses and at least some of the faculty whose materials are posted there did not even know about this website let alone that their course materials were posted therein (http://www.coursehero.com/sitemap/states/California/); and

WHEREAS, The for-profit distribution of faculty-generated course materials by any unauthorized entity violates the faculty’s intellectual property rights (http://rgp.calpoly.edu/policy/IPT.html); and

WHEREAS, The for-profit distribution of student-generated lecture notes violates the Standards for Student Conduct (Title 5, Article 2, Section 41303 http://www.osrr.calpoly.edu/standardsforconduct/title5.asp); therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate acknowledge and publish the attached general guidelines regarding protecting copyright course materials provided by Albert Liddicoat, Associate Vice Provost, Academic Personnel.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee

Date: March 21, 2012
SUGGESTIONS TO PROTECT COURSE MATERIALS WHICH FACULTY MAINTAIN ARE COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

• Professors who choose to upload their documents on the internet should only do so through a password protected system such as Polylearn.

• Professors should instruct students about copyright issues and inform students that they are not authorized to upload faculty provided materials to a website without the faculty member's explicit permission. Instructors may choose to include this information on their course syllabi.

• If a professor provides students with written materials and the professor believes he/she has a copyright ownership interest in the material, the following notation should be included on the document:

"Copyright [year] [professor's name]" e.g., Copyright 2010 John Smith.

• Professor should remind students that the unauthorized upload of a professor's documents could violate CSU's Student Conduct Code (Title 5, California Code of Regulations Section 41301), subjecting the student to possible disciplinary action.

• If a professor created material that he/she believes is copyright protected and discovers that material has been published on a website without authorization, the professor may wish to contact the website contact person and request the material be removed. In most cases, this should be sufficient. However, if the website's designated contact person is uncooperative, the Office of General Council provides the following guidance for faculty who wish to request that their copyrighted materials be removed from the websites. The professor should send a letter to the website contact person which includes the following information:

1. Identify in sufficient detail the copyrighted material or work the professor believes has been infringed upon or other information sufficient to identify the copyrighted work. Providing the URL of the allegedly infringing work may be the best way for the website's contact person to locate the content quickly.

2. Provide your contact information. Generally, an email address is preferred.

3. If possible, provide the website's contact personnel with information to permit them to notify the individual that provided the allegedly infringing material to the website about your claim.

4. Include the following statements in the written request:

"I have a good faith belief that use of the copyrighted materials described above as allegedly infringing is not authorized by me as the copyright owner, my agent, or the law."

"I swear under penalty of perjury, that the information in this notification is accurate and that I am the copyright owner or am authorized to act on behalf of the owner of an exclusive right that
is allegedly infringed."

5. Sign the document and send it to the designated website contact person.

For additional information, The University of Texas has a comprehensive website which addresses copyright issues in the higher education context. It can be accessed at www.utsystem.edu/ogc/intellectualproperty/cprtindx.htm

Albert A. Liddicoat, Ph.D.
Associate Vice Provost, Academic Personnel
March 13, 2012

To: CSU Presidents

From: Ephraim P. Smith
Executive Vice Chancellor and
Chief Academic Officer

Benjamin F. Quillian
Executive Vice Chancellor and
Chief Financial Officer

Subject: Special Executive Council March 8, 2012, Meeting — Enrollment Planning and Management

This communication follows from the special Executive Council meeting on March 8, 2012, and presents revised enrollment planning and management assumptions, limitations, and guidance.

1. CY 2013-14 Resident FTES Targets and Limits
   A. The resident FTES planning target for CY 2013-14 is 321,806 FTES, which is 3 percent lower than the CY 2012-13 baseline FTES. This planning target is based on the two-year budget assumption that the $200 million trigger cut will occur. Discussion at the special Executive Council meeting clarified that too much flexibility was provided for the reduced CY 2013-14 resident planning targets at the upper limit. Campuses should plan to annualize within 2 percent under or 3 percent over the CY 2013-14 resident target. Channel Islands and Maritime Academy are exempt.
   B. For campuses to provide authentic access within this narrowed band, enrollment management limitations and guidance for CY 2011-12 and CY 2012-13 are presented below.

2. CY 2011-12 Enrollment Management
   A. Campuses should continue to enforce CSU policies regarding standards for student academic progress. While Facilitating Graduation and The Graduation Initiative activities still may be boosting overall retention, students who are not meeting academic progress standards are preventing eligible high school seniors and community college students from entering the CSU; disqualification and other policies should be enforced.
   B. Campuses should continue to award degrees to “super seniors” and others who have completed a major degree or credential program. Despite recent efforts, there continue to be students who have been subsidized for well over the annualized FTES of state-supported instruction that are needed to complete their degree or credential program.
3. **CY 2012-13 Enrollment Management**
   A. Beginning in fall 2012, awards of the State University Grant (SUG) will only cover systemwide tuition-fees. The SUG will no longer be used for any other student expenses. In this way, SUG resources can be extended to additional needy students. Other student expenses can be met from other sources of financial aid.
   B. Beginning fall 2012, all campuses will limit student enrollment to a courseload that enables the student to complete a degree or credential program in the "traditional" time to completion. As instructional resources are rationed, campuses will continue to provide students with the opportunity to complete their baccalaureate degree in four years, their teaching credential in one year, and their master’s degree in two years.
      i. This limitation sets a ceiling that will generally provide sufficient opportunities for students to progress toward completion while allowing campuses to make intentional plans to control the distribution of their instructional resources.
      ii. Campuses that already have multi-staged enrollment processes may continue to utilize these provided that ceilings are set and recognized, that is, to a **15-to-16 unit ceiling for traditional 120 semester/180 quarter unit baccalaureate degree programs**. The 16-unit ceiling recognizes some mathematics and science semester courses require four units and, thus, a traditional load might rise to 16 semester units.
      iii. Exceptions to the default ceilings may be authorized for academic programs requiring more than traditional minimum units to degree or for programs in which contractual obligations with students exist. For example, engineering baccalaureate degree programs tend to exceed the 120 semester/180 quarter unit framework.
      iv. The units to degree for double majors and majors with required minors that are used in the setting of ceilings may not exceed that of one generic major degree program. Graduates of private, non-profit, and public higher education institutions have been able to complete their programs with the equivalent of 120 semester/180 quarter units through thoughtful streamlining of course requirements for the degree.

4. **Winter/Spring 2013 Admission Cycles.**
   A. The system will post on CSUMentor that CSU campuses are NOT open for winter/spring 2013 admissions with the following exception:
      Seven CSU campuses will open for winter/spring 2013 admissions **only** to serve SB 1440 transfer AA applicants: Channel Islands, Chico, East Bay, Fullerton, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Sonoma. These campuses will close at the end of the initial filing period.
   B. Note that nine campuses are projected to be more than 103 percent over their CY 2011-12 target and are not to open for winter/spring 2013 admissions at all: Bakersfield, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Humboldt, Northridge, Sacramento, San Jose, San Marcos, and Stanislaus.
   C. Note that seven campuses are planning fall admission cycles only, from CY 2012-13 through CY 2013-14: Long Beach, Maritime Academy, Monterey Bay, Pomona, San Bernardino, San Diego, and San Luis Obispo.
D. Presidents of campuses that are obligated, largely through contract, to admit and enroll new students in winter/spring 2013 must confer with both Executive Vice Chancellors Smith and Quillian about the types and numbers of new undergraduate, postbaccalaureate, and graduate students (e.g., nursing programs, teacher credentialing programs) that they are obligated to serve. Not opening for admission includes not opening for new undergraduate, postbaccalaureate, and graduate admission, as well as not opening for readmission of returning native and transfer undergraduate, postbaccalaureate, and graduate students.

5. CY 2013-14 Admission Cycles
   A. All campuses are expected to have studied, analyzed, and planned activities, including enhancing campus enrollment planning and management tools, to manage towards the campus’ CY 2013-14 resident FTES planning target.
   B. The $55.00 need-based post-baccalaureate application fee waiver will be discontinued beginning with the fall 2013 admission cycle which begins October 1, 2012. Post-baccalaureate students who apply for credential programs, graduate programs, 2nd baccalaureate degrees, and any other post-baccalaureate status (PBU) will be required to pay the $55 fee for each application submitted. This discontinuation applies only to need-based application fee waivers in which eligibility determination is based on self-reported family size and income information from the application for admission. The change does not affect other application fee waivers such as those for employees, third party payments (i.e. veterans), or other enrollment opportunities such as intrasystem visitors, cross-enrollment, etc. for which an application fee is not assessed.
   C. Ineligible undergraduate applicants and postbaccalaureate applicants who are not eligible for and seeking admission to a teaching credential, a high-demand (economic) second baccalaureate, or a master's/doctoral degree program should not be admitted.
   D. Campuses also should consider suspending admission to degree and credential programs that are either unsustainable or are of lower academic priority, recalling that current students must be offered the instruction to complete the program.
   E. To provide as much flexibility as possible, the CSU will receive applications during the initial filing period, but the final setting of CY 2013-14 resident FTES targets and notice regarding fall 2013 admission offers will be based on November tax measure election results. The fall 2013 priority application filing period is from October 1 to November 30, 2012. All eligible students will be waitlisted until a date to be determined in December 2012; that is, fall 2013 admission may be not be offered until final resident targets are set and systemwide notice is provided.
   F. The possibility of not opening for winter/spring 2014 admissions, likewise, could be based on November tax measure election results.

Campus plans, submitted before the March 8th Executive Council meeting, projected a reduction of over 16,000 headcount students, with over 11,000 resulting from reductions in the numbers of new, returning, and transitory undergraduate, postbaccalaureate, and graduate students and the balance through conservative increases in degree awards and enhanced enforcement of standards of student academic progress. We anticipate that more robust degree completion, enhanced enforcement of student progress, not opening for winter/spring 2013 admission cycles, and
possibly not opening for winter/spring 2014 admission cycles could reduce the number of CSU students by another 9,000 to 10,000. Given the daunting budget planning assumption that the $200 million budget trigger will be pulled in November 2012, these additional enrollment management actions, as well as others described in this memorandum, should bring the number of students in the CSU down to a level the CSU can serve fairly, equitably, and well.

If you have any questions regarding this memorandum, please feel free to contact us.

Attachment

c. Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
   Provosts/Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
   Vice Presidents, Administration/Finance
   Vice Presidents, Student Affairs
ACCREDITATION UPDATE

✓ Cuesta remains accredited!
✓ Your classes will transfer!
✓ You can finish your degree and certificate programs!
✓ Your financial aid is safe!

WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

- The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) accredits Cuesta College.
- Cuesta’s accreditation means that your college work is recognized by other accredited educational institutions.
- Cuesta has been placed on “Show Cause” status by ACCJC, and the college has to show why it should remain accredited.
- All college employees are working together to address the concerns of ACCJC.
- Under “Show Cause” status, Cuesta must also prepare a plan to take care of you and your coursework in case ACCJC does not reaccredit.
- Your coursework through June 2013 is accredited as we work to reaffirm our status.

CUESTA COLLEGE

Call or Click to Learn More
http://academic.cuesta.edu/accreditation/
The Vice President of Student Services (805) 546-3116
The following is a calendar of events that you might be interested in and want to share with others:

| October 2012 | Cuesta’s accreditation follow-up report is due October 15 to our accrediting commission. |
| November 2012 | A visiting team will come to the college to talk with key individuals about our follow-up report and examine what the college has done to address the concerns of the accrediting commission. After their visit, the team will write a report of how well they feel we have addressed the concerns of the accrediting commission. This report will be sent to our accrediting commission for their consideration. |
| January 2013 | The accrediting commission meets to decide on our accreditation status. Their decision could be anyone of the following:  
- Reaffirm Cuesta’s accreditation unconditionally for six years
- Move Cuesta to the lesser sanction of “Probation” or “Warning” for 6 months to a year
- Continue Cuesta’s “Show Cause” status for another 6 months to a year
- Remove Cuesta’s Accreditation (effective June, 2013) |

* If our accrediting commission were to remove Cuesta’s accreditation which has happened to only one out of 112 community colleges in California (and that was due to illegal activities, which is not the case with Cuesta) our State Chancellor’s Office would work to find another institution that would take over Cuesta as part of their institution or make provisions for students to complete their degrees and/or certificate. Even in this worse case scenario accredited classes would be offered at Cuesta’s campuses and would transfer, services would be provided, and all degrees and certificates would be awarded under the absorbing institution’s name.