

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE
805.756.1258

Meeting of the ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, October 31, 2000
UU220, 3:00 to 5:00pm

- I. Minutes: **Approval of minutes for the Academic Senate Executive Committee meeting of October 3, 2000** (pp. 2-3).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair:
 - B. President's Office:
 - C. Provost's Office:
 - D. Statewide Senators:
 - E. CFA Campus President:
 - F. ASI Representatives:
 - G. Other: **Joe Grimes: faculty development**
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. **Academic Senate/Senate committee/university-wide committee vacancies:** (p. 4)
 - B. **Election of nominees for the Consultative Committee for the Selection of the Vice President for Student Affairs:** (information sent previously via email).
 - C. **Resolution on Choice of Catalog Requests Older Than 10 Years:** Breitenbach, chair of Instruction Committee (p. 5).
 - D. **Resolution on Information Technology Resources Responsible Use Policy:** Grimes, chair of IACC (pp. 6-16).
 - E. **Academic Calendars:** Breitenbach, chair of Instruction Committee (pp. 17-30).
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
 - A. [Discussion/Action Item] **Curriculum Committee's Response to Math Resolution:** Keesey, chair of Curriculum Committee (pp. 31-41).
 - B. **Campus representation on the Academic Senate CSU:** (p. 42).
 - C. **San Diego's Policy for Distance Courses:** (pp. 43-47).
 - D. **Other.**
- VII. Adjournment:

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE
805.756.1258

*Minutes of the
Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, October 3, 2000
UU220, 3:00 to 5:00pm*

Preparatory: The meeting was opened at 3:12pm.

- I. Minutes: The minutes of the July 29, 2000 Executive Committee meeting were approved with one change as follows:

Robert Detweiler requested that the Senate appoint a representative to the ~~ASI/~~UU Task Force Search Committee for ASI Director. Dave Hannings was approved as the Senate representative to this task force.

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

- III. Reports:

- A. Academic Senate Chair:
- B. President's Office:
- C. Provost's Office: (Zingg) Enrollment was short of target for 2000-2001 (~120 students). Acceptance patterns of the past five years didn't hold true this year. Different approaches to enrollment management are being considered.
- D. Statewide Senators: (Hood) The statewide Faculty Affairs Committee is preparing a proposal regarding faculty housing.
- E. CFA Campus President:
- F. ASI Representatives: (Love) ASI is considering some new programs: An OSCAR office (Office of Student Concern Advocacy Resource) and an advocacy council where members from college and university councils would interact to discuss campus problems.
- G. Other:

- IV. Consent Agenda:

- V. Business Item(s):

- A. **Academic Senate/Senate committee vacancies:** none.
- B. **University-wide committee vacancies:** Alyson McLamore (Music) was appointed to the Campus Fee Advisory Committee and Mike Ruef (UCTE) was appointed to the Student Health Advisory Committee.
- C. **Curriculum proposals:** (Keesey) Program proposals will go through the normal first and second reading procedure. Course proposals will be placed on the Consent Agenda. Course proposals will be posted on the web and faculty will be emailed with the URL. Any faculty member can pull a course from the Consent Agenda if they notify the Academic Senate office before November 6. Courses pulled can then be discussed,

amended, or voted upon at the November 21 Senate meeting. Agendized for the October 24 Senate meeting.

- D. **Resolution on Academic Program Review:** Morrobel-Sosa. Under the proposed process, external and internal program reviews will occur jointly, minimizing the review process. Each discipline will decide what its review is to be based upon. Agendized for the October 24 Senate meeting.
 - E. **Resolution on Choice of Catalog Requests Older Than 10 Years:** This resolution was pulled from the agenda by the chair of the Instruction Committee.
 - F. **Campus Nomination for Faculty Trustee:** Harold Goldwhite was nominated as Faculty Trustee to the CSU Board of Trustees for 2000-2001. The nomination will be emailed to the Chair of the Academic Senate CSU.
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
Faculty referendum to modify the *Constitution of the Faculty* making the part time representative position on the Academic Senate an elected position: Due to confusion regarding the intent of last year's resolution on this matter, a subcommittee was appointed to determine the resolution's intent. The subcommittee will draft the ballot to be sent to General Faculty for its vote. Subcommittee members are Lee Burgunder, Margaret Camuso, Harvey Greenwald, and Myron Hood.
- VII. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:50pm.

Submitted by:



Margaret Camuso
Academic Senate

10.23.00

Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2000-2001
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

Grants Review Committee
Doug Cerf

Department
Accounting

Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2000-2001
COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE

Faculty Affairs Committee
(Replacement for Mark Berrio)
David Dubbink

Department
City & Regional Planning

Faculty Ethics Committee

Student Grievance
Brian Kesner

Architecture

UNIVERSITY-WIDE COMMITTEES
Vacancies for 2000-2002

CAMPUS SAFETY AND RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
(1 Vacancy/2 Appointments)

Department

Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-____-00/
RESOLUTION ON
CHOICE OF CATALOG REQUESTS OLDER THAN 10 YEARS

1 WHEREAS Some students leave Cal Poly without finishing their remaining degree requirements; and

2
3 WHEREAS There are no written guidelines for students who request to graduate on a catalog older than
4 10 years; and
5

6 WHEREAS The Chancellor's Office will not allow the back dating of degrees or disclaimers on degrees
7 indicating the majority of the coursework was finished over ten years ago; and
8

9 WHEREAS Cal Poly has a responsibility to ensure that degrees awarded with a current date reflect
10 learning that is reasonably up-to-date; therefore, be it
11

12 RESOLVED Students may request to complete their degrees on a catalog older than 10 years if the only
13 remaining degree requirements at the time they left Cal Poly do not exceed 16 units. These
14 remaining degree requirements may include senior project, GWR, and/or USCP; and be it
15 further
16

17 RESOLVED The decision to approve or disapprove a student's request is based on (1) his/her willingness
18 to commit to completing outstanding degree requirements within a specified timeframe, and
19 (2) his/her ability to demonstrate, with written documentation, reasonable currency of
20 knowledge and skills in his/her degree field to the satisfaction of the faculty in the applicable
21 major, as certified by the Department Chair. Both the College Dean and the Vice Provost for
22 Academic Programs & Undergraduate Education must give their approval.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Date: October 13, 2000

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AS-___-00/IACC
RESOLUTION ON
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES
RESPONSIBLE USE POLICY**

- 1 WHEREAS, Information technology resources are a finite shared resource provided to students, faculty,
2 and staff to support Cal Poly's mission of education, research, and service; and
3
4 WHEREAS, The University is accountable for ensuring that its resources are used responsibly; and
5
6 WHEREAS, A clear and comprehensive policy is needed to inform the campus community about
7 appropriate use and to enable the University to act when misuses occur; and
8
9 WHEREAS, An interim policy has been in effect since the start of Fall Quarter 2000 and is posted on
10 the Cal Poly web site at <http://its.calpoly.edu/Policies/RUP-INT/>; and
11
12 WHEREAS, The policy incorporates existing University, CSU, and state policies as well as federal and
13 state laws, reflects best practices from other universities, and provides specific examples
14 of appropriate and inappropriate uses; and
15
16 WHEREAS, The policy recognizes and respects academic freedom, freedom of expression, and the
17 right to privacy of individual users wherever possible; and
18
19 WHEREAS, The policy uses established University processes to address alleged violations by Cal Poly
20 students, faculty, and staff; and will be reviewed and updated at least annually to reflect
21 changes in policy, the law, and technology; and
22
23 WHEREAS, Information Technology Services will consult with the Academic Senate and other campus
24 constituent groups on substantive changes to this policy and on the development of related
25 information technology policies and practices; and
26
27 WHEREAS, The Instructional Advisory Committee on Computing (IACC), Administrative Advisory
28 Committee on Computing (AACC), and Information Resources Management Policy and
29 Planning Committee (IRMPPC) have endorsed the policy and recommended that it be
30 adopted and implemented by the University; therefore, be it
31
32 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the Information Technology Resources Responsible
33 Use Policy and recommend that it be adopted and implemented by the University.

Proposed by: Instructional Advisory Committee
on Computing (IACC)
Date: October 23, 2000

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Information Technology Resources Responsible Use Policy (Interim)

August, 2000

Table of Contents

- A. Scope
- B. Purpose
- C. Guiding Principles
- D. Policy Application
- E. Policy Provisions
 - 1. Authorized Use/Access
 - 2. Data Security, Confidentiality and Privacy
 - 3. Record Retention and Disclosure
 - 4. Network and System Integrity
 - 5. Academic Honesty
 - 6. Commercial Use
 - 7. Political Advocacy
 - 8. Harassment
 - 9. Copyright and Fair Use
 - 10. Trademark and Patents
 - 11. Electronic Communications
 - 12. Web Sites
- F. Policy Enforcement
- G. Consequences of Non-Compliance
- H. Reporting Irresponsible or Inappropriate Use
- I. Policy Review and Practices Oversight
- J. Glossary and Definition of Terms
- K. Specific Examples of Responsible and Irresponsible Use
- L. References and Works Cited

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Information Technology Resources Responsible Use Policy (Interim)

August, 2000

A. Scope

This policy applies to any user of the University's information technology resources, whether initiated from a computer located on or off-campus. This includes any computer and information system or resource, including means of access, networks, and the data residing thereon. This policy applies to the use of all University information technology

resources whether centrally-administered or locally-administered. Administrators of individual or dedicated University resources may enact additional policies specific to those resources provided they do not conflict with the provisions of this and other official policies and laws. Users are subject to both the provisions of this policy and any policies specific to the individual systems they use.

B. Purpose

The principal concern of this responsible use policy is the effective and efficient use of information technology resources. The primary focus is to insure that the resources are used in a manner that does not impair or impede the use of these resources by others in their pursuit of the mission of the University. This policy is intended to ensure

- the integrity, reliability, and good performance of University resources;
- that the resource-user community operates according to established policies and applicable laws;
- that these resources are used for their intended purposes; and
- that appropriate measures are in place to assure the policy is honored.

The policy is intended to permit, rather than proscribe, reasonable resource-user access within institutional priorities and financial capabilities.

This policy is intended to promote and encourage responsible use while minimizing the potential for misuse by clarifying and encompassing existing policies.

In its development, the policy has been carefully framed to avoid creating undue overhead in and of itself, or imposing broad-based restrictions on all users.

C. Guiding Principles

The following principles underlie this policy and should guide its application and interpretation:

1. Freedom of thought, inquiry, and expression is a paramount value of the Cal Poly community. To preserve that freedom, the community relies on the integrity and responsible use of University resources by each of its members.
2. Information technology resources are provided to support the University's mission of education, research and service. To ensure that these shared and finite resources are used effectively to further the University's mission, each user has the responsibility to:
 - use the resources appropriately and efficiently;
 - respect the freedom and privacy of others;
 - protect the stability and security of the resources; and
 - understand and fully abide by established University policies and applicable public laws.

D. Policy Application

As a general guideline, the institution regards the principle of academic freedom to be a key factor in assuring the effective application of this policy and its procedures and

practices. The law is another essential source of guidance. The University's roles in supporting or acting to enforce such law is also critical to how this policy will be applied.

1. All existing laws (federal, state and local) and State of California, California State University and Cal Poly regulations and policies apply, including not only laws and regulations that are specific to computers and networks, but also those that may apply generally to personal conduct. This may also include laws of other states and countries where material is accessed electronically via University resources by users within those jurisdictions or material originating within those jurisdictions is accessed via University resources.
2. The accessibility of certain University information technology resources, such as network-based services, implies a degree of risk that the existence, viewing or receipt of such information/content may be offensive. As a matter of policy, the University protects expression by members of its community and does not wish to become an arbiter of what may be regarded as "offensive" by some members of the community. However, in exceptional cases, the University may decide that such material directed at individuals or classes of individuals presents such a hostile environment under the law that certain restrictive actions are warranted.
3. The University reserves the right to limit access to its resources when policies or laws are violated and to use appropriate means to safeguard its resources, preserve network/system integrity, and ensure continued service delivery at all times. This includes monitoring routing information of communications across its network services and transaction records residing on University resources, scanning systems attached to the Cal Poly network for security problems, disconnecting systems that have become a security hazard, and restricting the material transported across the network or posted on University systems.
4. All provisions of this policy are currently in effect.

E. Policy Provisions

1. Authorized Use / Access

Access to Cal Poly's information technology resources is a privilege granted to faculty, staff and students in support of their studies, instruction, duties as employees, official business with the University, and/or other University-sanctioned activities. Access may also be granted to individuals outside of Cal Poly for purposes consistent with the mission of the University.

Access to Cal Poly information technology resources may not be transferred or extended by members of the University community to outside individuals or groups without prior approval of the Vice Provost/Chief Information Officer

Gaining access to the University's information technology resources does not imply the right to use those resources. The University reserves the right to limit, restrict, remove or extend access to and privileges within, material posted on, or communications via its information technology resources, consistent with this policy and applicable law, and irrespective of the originating access point.

It is expected that these resources will be used efficiently and responsibly in support of the mission of the University as set forth in this policy. All other use not consistent with this policy may be considered unauthorized use.

2. Data Security, Confidentiality and Privacy

Cal Poly users are responsible for ensuring the confidentiality and appropriate use of institutional data to which they are given access, ensuring the security of the equipment where such information is held or displayed, and abiding by related privacy rights of students, faculty and staff concerning the use and release of personal information, as required by law or existing policies.

For the purposes of this policy, all institutional data processed is to be considered sensitive and/or confidential. Access to such data is based on an individual's "need to know" and is restricted to uses directly related to their assigned duties. Users are responsible for the security of any accounts issued in their name and any institutional data they may retrieve, modify, reproduce or destroy. Disclosure of confidential information to unauthorized persons or entities, or the use of such information for self-interest or advantage, is prohibited. Access to non-public institutional data by unauthorized persons or entities is prohibited.

All employees (non-student) and non-employees (including but not limited to auxiliary employees, volunteers, Military Science personnel, and exchange faculty) granted access to institutional data are required to sign a statement that they have received a copy of the University's Confidentiality-Security Policy. Refusal to sign will result in denial of access to that data and may result in demotion or dismissal if such access is an inherent part of their assigned duties. Users with access to student information further agree to abide by the University's Policy on the Use and Release of Student Information.

Electronic mail and computer files are considered private to the fullest extent permitted by law. Access to such files will generally require permission of the sender/recipient of a message or the owner of the account in which the material resides, court order, or other actions defined by law. However, in the event of a University investigation for alleged misconduct, e-mail or files may be locked or copied to prevent destruction and loss of information.

Requests for disclosure of confidential information and retention of potential evidence will be honored when approved by authorized University officials or required by state or federal law.

All users of Cal Poly's information technology resources are advised to consider the open nature of information disseminated electronically, and should not assume any degree of privacy or restricted access to such information. Cal Poly strives to provide the highest degree of security when transferring data, but cannot be held responsible if these measures are circumvented and information is intercepted, copied, read, forged, destroyed or misused by others.

3. Record Retention and Disclosure

Original electronic materials and/or copies may be retained for specified periods of time on system backups and other locations; however the University does not warrant that such information can be retrieved. Unless otherwise required by law and/or policy, Cal Poly reserves the right to delete stored files and messages to

preserve system integrity. Except in an emergency, users will be given advance notice to delete files and messages.

Electronic files or messages, whether or not created and stored on University resources, may constitute a University record subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act or other laws, or as a result of litigation. Electronic copies must be provided in response to a public record request or legally issued subpoena, subject to very limited exceptions, as with other documents created and retained by the University.

4. Network and System Integrity

In accordance with California State Penal Code Section 502, Cal Poly's Computer Crimes Policy (URL), CSU's 4Cnet Acceptable Use Policy (URL) and other policies and laws, activities and behaviors that threaten the integrity of computer networks or systems are prohibited on both University-owned and privately-owned equipment operated on or through University resources. These activities and behaviors include but are not limited to:

- Interference with or disruption of computer systems and networks and related services, including but not limited to the propagation of computer "worms," "viruses" and "Trojan Horses"
- Intentionally or carelessly performing an act that places an excessive load on a computer or network to the extent that other users may be denied service or the use of electronic networks or information systems may be disrupted
- Processing excessively large amounts of data or excessive system utilization to the extent that these interfere with network or system performance unless authorized in advance by the administrator(s) responsible for all of the affected systems
- Failure to comply with requests from authorized University officials to discontinue activities that threaten the operation or integrity of computers, systems or networks
- Revealing passwords or otherwise permitting the use by others, by intent or negligence, of University-assigned accounts for computer and network access. Individual password security is the responsibility of each user.
- Altering or attempting to alter files or systems without authorization
- Unauthorized scanning of ports, computers and networks for security vulnerabilities or other information
- Unauthorized attempts to circumvent data protection schemes or uncover security loopholes
- Connecting unauthorized equipment to the campus network or computers
- Attempting to alter any University computing or network components without authorization or beyond one's level of authorization, including but not limited to bridges, routers, hubs, wiring, connections, etc.
- Negligently or intentionally damaging University electronic information, information technology resources, computing systems or networks
- Utilizing network or system identification numbers or names that are not assigned for one's specific use on the designated system
- Using campus resources to gain unauthorized access to any computer system and/or using someone else's computer without their permission
- Providing services or accounts on University computers or via University

networks to other users from a personal computer unless required to meet the normal activities of students working as individuals or in collaborative groups to fulfill current course requirements. University authorized business and other activities directly related to the academic mission of the University, are also excluded.

- Registering a Cal Poly address with any other domain name

The guiding principle here is the responsible use of University resources and *not* current or potential designs, capabilities or functionality of information technology resources including operating systems, hardware, software, and the Internet.

5. Academic Honesty

The University will not tolerate academic cheating, plagiarism or theft of intellectual property in any form. Users of information technology resources are expected to uphold the highest academic standards in accordance with the Campus Code of Conduct and other University policies.

6. Commercial Use

Use of the University's information technology resources is strictly prohibited for unauthorized commercial activities, personal gain, and private, or otherwise unrelated to the University, business or fundraising. This includes soliciting, promoting, selling, marketing or advertising products or services, or reselling University resources.

Campus auxiliary organizations are authorized to provide services and products to students, faculty and staff, and invited guests of the University through operating and service support leases. The University President or designee may authorize additional limited commercial uses under separate policy provisions. Such uses are excepted from the above prohibitions. These prohibitions are not intended to infringe on authorized uses that enable students, staff and faculty to carry out their duties and assignments in support of the University mission.

Detailed guidelines are being developed to clarify exceptions to this provision.

7. Political Advocacy

It is generally inappropriate for individual employees to use University resources to engage in political advocacy in election campaigns. State law generally prohibits the use of public funds for this purpose and Government Code Section 8314 makes it illegal for any state employee or consultant to use or permit others to use state resources for any campaign activity not authorized by law.

An employee can be held personally liable for intentionally or negligently violating Government Code Section 8314 for up to \$1,000 per day the violation occurs plus three times the value of the unlawful use of state resources. Due to the personal nature of this activity, the State of California would not indemnify or defend the employee if an action was pursued against them for violating this statute.

The courts have yet to address the specific issue of whether an individual's use of

state supported e-mail for political purposes violates the law. While the University may choose not to be involved in deciding whether a personal communication violates this provision, other policy provisions may apply and an employee may still be subject to personal liability under the law. Employees should exercise appropriate caution prior to engaging in such activities, which may have negative consequences for them and the University.

This provision does not apply to political activities related to on-campus student government, including the conduct of student elections, or student club activities and sponsored events conducted with prior approval of the University. Such activities must comply with all other provisions of this policy, including the section on electronic communications, when using University resources.

8. Harassment

Harassment of others via electronic methods is prohibited under California State Penal Code Section 653m, other applicable laws and University policies. It is a violation of this policy to use electronic means to harass, threaten, or otherwise cause harm to a specific individual(s), whether by direct or indirect reference. It may be a violation of this policy to use electronic means to harass or threaten groups of individuals by creating a hostile environment.

9. Copyright and Fair Use

Federal copyright law applies to all forms of information, including electronic communications. Infringements of copyright laws include, but are not limited to, making unauthorized copies of any copyrighted material (including software, text, images, audio, and video), and displaying or distributing copyrighted materials over computer networks without the author's permission except as provided in limited form by copyright fair use restrictions. The "fair use" provision of the copyright law allows for limited reproduction and distribution of published works without permission for such purposes as criticism, news reporting, teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use), scholarship, or research. For more information on this issue, see Stanford University's Copyright and Fair Use website.

10. Trademarks and Patents

Unauthorized use of trade secrets and trademarked names or symbols, including Cal Poly's, is prohibited. Student, faculty and staff use of University information technology resources in the creation of inventions and other intellectual property that may be patented, trademarked or licensed for commercial purposes must be consistent with Cal Poly's Intellectual Property Policy.

11. Electronic Communications

University electronic communications are to be used to enhance and facilitate teaching, learning, scholarly research, support academic experiences, to facilitate the effective business and administrative processes of the University, and to foster effective communications within the academic community.

The following activities and behaviors are prohibited on University or privately owned

equipment or networks operated on University resources:

- Altering electronic communications to hide one's identity or to impersonate another individual. All e-mail, news posts, chat sessions, or any other form of electronic communication must contain the sender's real name and/or user id.
- Initiating or forwarding electronic "chain letters"
- "Mail bombing"
- Sending unsolicited commercial advertisements or solicitations ("spam")
- Operating unofficial e-mail reflectors
- Sending messages to large numbers of users except as defined (see Large Mailings and Broadcast Messages)
- Use of system aliases by non-authorized personnel
- Use of official aliases to broadcast unofficial and/or unauthorized messages
- Use of e-mail systems to commit a crime

Cal Poly reserves the right to send electronic communications, including large group or broadcast messages, to its own users. Such official messages are permitted only if sent via authorized distribution methods to reduce the system load and should conform to the guidelines for Large Mailings and Broadcast Messages.

The University reserves the right to perform broadcast messages related to emergencies and University physical plant conditions or activities for which urgent notice is required and that will potentially affect most of the recipients. The University reserves the right to limit the size of individual messages being transmitted through University resources.

12. Web Sites

An official Cal Poly web page is one which is formally acknowledged by the chief officer of a University department or division as representing that entity accurately and in a manner consistent with Cal Poly's mission. Without such acknowledgment, a web site, regardless of content, is not "official." Official pages are the property and responsibility of the divisions that create them.

"Unofficial" information may also be posted and maintained by individual students, faculty, staff and student organizations. Cal Poly does not undertake to edit, screen, monitor, or censor information posted by unofficial authors, whether or not originated by unofficial authors or third parties, and does not accept any responsibility or liability for such information even when it is conveyed through University-owned servers.

Both official and unofficial web sites are subject to the other provisions of this policy if they use University resources such as University-owned servers and the Cal Poly network to transmit and receive information.

F. Policy Enforcement

The Vice Provost/Chief Information Officer is authorized by the President to implement and enforce this policy. The Vice Provost or designee will determine whether the policy has been violated, secure potential evidence, take action where appropriate, and refer the matter to other campus units or external agents for action as appropriate.

Enforcement will be based upon receipt by Information Technology Services of one or more formal complaints about a specific incident or through discovery of a possible violation in the normal course of administering information technology resources.

Appeals of University actions resulting from enforcement of this policy will be handled through existing disciplinary/grievance processes for Cal Poly students and employees.

G. Consequences of Non-Compliance

1. University Informal

Minor infractions of this policy, when accidental or unintentional, such as consuming excessive resources or overloading computer systems, are generally resolved informally by the unit administering the resource. This may be done through e-mail or in-person discussion and education.

2. University Formal

Serious incidents of non-compliance may lead to University disciplinary action under CSU and University disciplinary policies and procedures for students and employees, employee contract provisions where appropriate, private civil action, and/or criminal charges. Serious incidents of non-compliance include but are not limited to unauthorized use of computer resources, attempts to steal passwords or data, unauthorized use or copying of licensed software, repeated harassment, or threatening behavior.

Offenders may be referred to their sponsoring advisor, department, college, supervisor, manager, program administrator, or other appropriate University office. If the individual is a student, the matter may be referred to the Office of Campus Student Relations and Judicial Affairs. If the offender is a member of the staff or faculty, the matter may be referred to Human Resources and Employment Equity or Faculty Affairs.

3. Civil and Criminal

In addition to the above, inappropriate use of information technology resources may result in personal criminal, civil and other administrative liability.

H. Reporting Irresponsible or Inappropriate Use

Suspected infractions of this policy involving campuswide shared information technology resources, potentially bearing external or legal consequences for the University, or originating from an outside source, should be reported to Information Technology Services at complaints@calpoly.edu.

Information Technology Services will advise the user on what if any action to take, act directly when appropriate, and/or refer the complaint to other offices for further action. They will also assist other offices with investigations of suspected infractions when appropriate. Information Technology Services may also be contacted to report infractions when the complainant is unable, or it is not desirable, to do so through other channels.

Suspected infractions occurring on external or departmental systems should be reported to the administrator responsible for the system or network involved for further action. A copy

should be sent to complaints@calpoly.edu for tracking purposes.

There might be situations when the following additional offices/officials should be notified:

- **Supervisors, Department Heads, Deans, Administrators, Program Managers - Human Resources and Employment Equity - Faculty Affairs** - If the incident occurs in the course of employment with the University.
- **Office of Academic Records** - If the incident involves inappropriate use of Cal Poly student information. The registrar is responsible for investigating reports of Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA) violations and maintaining records for the Department of Education.
- **Information Security Officer - System Security Chairs** - If the incident involves inappropriate access to or use of institutional data.
- **Cal Poly University Police** - If an individual's health and safety appears to be in jeopardy or a violation of law may be involved.

System and network administrators, supervisors or offices that receive a complaint and are presented with evidence that a possible violation of the policy has occurred, should contact Information Technology Services at complaints@calpoly.edu.

I. Policy Review and Practices Oversight

The Vice Provost for Information Technology/Chief Information Officer is responsible for application and enforcement of this policy. The Acceptable Use Policy sub-Committee (AUPC) of the Information Resources Management Policy and Planning Committee (IRMPPC) shall review this policy on an annual basis, make recommendations for any changes, and provide oversight and periodic review of the practices used to implement this policy. Recommended changes shall be reviewed and approved by the Vice Provost/Chief Information Officer in consultation with the IRMPPC and the President. The current version of the policy will be posted and maintained on the Cal Poly web site.

J. Glossary and Definition of Terms

Appendix A - <http://www.calpoly.edu/~its/Policies/RUP-INT/define.htm>

K. Specific Examples of Responsible and Irresponsible Uses

Appendix B - <http://www.calpoly.edu/~its/Policies/RUP-INT/example.htm>

L. References and Works Cited

Appendix C - <http://www.calpoly.edu/~its/Policies/RUP-INT/refer.htm>

MEMORANDUM

CAL POLY STATE UNIVERSITY

To: Myron Hood, Chair
Academic Senate

Date: October 23, 2000

From: Stacey Breitenbach, Chair
Academic Senate Instruction Committee

CC: instruction committee

RE: Academic Calendar for Summer Quarter 2002 to Spring Quarter 2003

The Instruction Committee met today and discussed the two proposals presented in the October 3rd memo from Paul Zingg. The committee voted for proposal two (6 votes for proposal two and four votes for proposal one) mostly because of the additional time provided for students that work in the summer and the longer break for those students that attend school year-round between summer and fall quarters.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

State of California
Memorandum

RECEIVED

OCT 06 2000

ACADEMIC SENATE

CAL POLY

To: Myron Hood, Academic Senate Chair
College Deans (Academic Deans' Council)
Sam Aborne, President of ASI, Student Senate
Robert Detweiler, Student Affairs Council

Date: October 3, 2000

Cc: Warren Baker
William Boldt
Euel Kennedy
Frank Lebens
Frank Mumford
Academic Personnel
Human Resources

From: Paul J. Zingg 
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Proposals for the Academic Calendar for Summer Quarter 2002 to Spring Quarter 2003

Currently, Cal Poly is operating on an approved Academic Calendar extending through the end of Spring Quarter, 2002. Attached are two proposed academic calendars covering Summer Quarter 2002 to Spring Quarter 2003. Each proposal is accompanied by calendar considerations appropriate to that proposal, and a fifteen-month calendar displaying the final examination periods and academic holidays. Also included are copies of pertinent policies and guidelines that influence the calendar.

Proposal #2 is the calendar recommended and preferred by my staff and the offices that have been consulted initially. It begins the third week of September and allows two weeks of time between Summer and Fall terms. Proposal # 1, beginning a week earlier, allows only one week between Summer and Fall terms; classes would begin on Tuesday 9/17 (Yom Kippur is Monday, 9/16); and finals would begin the week immediately after Thanksgiving. Winter term for both proposals would begin on Monday January 6.

In accordance with C.A.M., Section 481, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs proposes a calendar to the President for approval following consultation with the Academic Senate, Academic Deans' Council, and Student Senate. In addition, the C.A.M. provision also mentions the Student Affairs Council, Foundation, and Vice President for Student Affairs as constituent groups that should be involved in consultation. Following any suggestions from these groups, the calendar can be modified to incorporate their recommendations or submitted to the President as proposed, along with a notation of recommended modifications.

Please send any reactions and/or recommendations to my office on or before Friday, December 1, 2000.

If you have any questions regarding the calendar development, please contact Kay Jensen, Academic Programs Office, via email (kjensen@calpoly.edu).

Attachments

Proposal #1 - Fall term begins Sept. 9; classes, Sept. 17

ACADEMIC CALENDAR for 2002-2003

SUMMER TERM 2002

June 18	Tuesday	Beginning of university year Beginning of summer term - classes begin
July 1	Monday	End of second week of instruction Last day to drop a class
July 2	Tuesday	Last day to add a class Last day to register late and pay late registration fee
July 4	Thursday	Academic holiday - Independence Day
July 9	Tuesday	End of third week of instruction - Census date ^k
August 6	Tuesday	End of seventh week of instruction
August 23	Friday	Last day of classes
August 26-30	Monday-Friday	Final examination period
August 30	Friday	End of summer term
August 31-September 8	Saturday-Sunday	Academic holiday

FALL TERM 2002

September 9	Monday	Beginning of fall term (faculty only)
September 16	Monday	Instructional Planning Day
September 17	Tuesday	Fall term classes begin
September 30	Monday	End of second week of instruction Last day to drop a class
October 1	Tuesday	Last day to add a class Last day to register late and pay late registration fee
October 7	Monday	End of third week of instruction - Census date
November 4	Monday	End of seventh week of instruction
November 11	Monday	Academic holiday - Veterans' Day
November 26	Tuesday	Last day of classes
November 27-December 1	Wednesday-Sunday	Academic holiday - Thanksgiving
December 2-6	Monday-Friday	Final examination period
December 7	Saturday	Mid-Year Commencement
December 9	Monday	End of fall term
December 10-January 5	Tuesday-Sunday	Grades Due Day Academic holiday

WINTER TERM 2003

January 6	Monday	Beginning of winter term - classes begin
January 17	Friday	End of second week of instruction Last day to drop a class
January 20	Monday	Academic holiday - Martin Luther King, Jr. Birthday Observed
January 21	Tuesday	Last day to add a class Last day to register late and pay late registration fee
January 27	Monday	End of third week of instruction - Census date
February 17	Monday	Academic holiday - George Washington's Birthday Observed
February 25	Tuesday	End of seventh week of instruction
March 14	Friday	Last day of classes
March 17-21	Monday-Friday	Final examination period
March 21	Friday	End of winter term
March 22-30	Saturday-Sunday	Academic holiday

SPRING TERM 2003

March 31	Monday	Beginning of spring term - classes begin
April 11	Friday	End of second week of instruction Last day to drop a class
April 14	Monday	Last day to add a class Last day to register late and pay late registration fee
April 18	Friday	End of third week of instruction - Census date
May 16	Friday	End of seventh week of instruction
May 26	Monday	Academic holiday - Memorial Day observed
June 6	Friday	Last day of classes
June 9-13	Monday-Friday	Final examination period
June 14	Saturday	Commencement
June 15-16	Sunday-Monday	End of spring term End of university year (faculty only) Academic holiday

SUMMARY OF CALENDAR DAYS

	Academic Year (fws)			
	Summer 2001	Fall 2001	Winter 2002	Spring 2002
Beginning Year/Term - WOW	--	5	--	--
MWF Days	29	29	28	29
TR Days	19	21	20	20
Total Qtr Instructional Days	48	50	48	49
Exams	5	5	5	5
Commencement	--	1	--	1
Grades Due Day	--	1	--	--
Total Qtr Academic Work Days	53	62	53	55

Total Academic Year Instructional Days (F-W-Sp) = 147

Total Academic Year Work Days (F-W-Sp) = 170

Summer Term 2002 (48 instructional days)

Summer term begins Tuesday, June 18.

Independence Day falls on Thursday, July 4.

There is a 9-day break between the end of summer term and the beginning of fall term.

Fall Term 2002 (50 instructional days)

Fall term begins on Monday, September 9.

Instruction begins on Tuesday, September 17, because Yom Kippur is Monday, September 16, and is designated an Instructional Planning Day. A "Grades Due Day" or "Evaluation Day" will be added at the end of the term, as the total academic year work days must not fall below the CSU policy minimum of 170, and instructional days minimum is 147.

Veterans' Day is observed on Monday, November 11.

Thanksgiving holiday is observed Wednesday, November 27 through Sunday, December 1.

Final exams begin the week following Thanksgiving holiday. Grades Due Day: Monday, December 9.

There is a 27-day break between the end of fall term and the beginning of winter term (nearly 4 weeks).

Winter Term 2003 (48 instructional days)

Winter term begins on Monday, January 6.

Martin Luther King's birthday is observed on Monday, January 20.

Washington's birthday is observed on Monday, February 17.

The last day of class is Friday, March 14.

There is a 9-day break between the end of term and the beginning of spring term.

Spring Term 2003 (49 instructional days)

Spring term begins on Monday, March 31.

Memorial Day is observed on Monday, May 26.

The last day of class is Friday, June 6.

Final Examination Week is from June 9 to 13.

There is a 2-day break between the end of spring term and the beginning of summer term.

FYI - Summer Term 2003 (48 instructional days)

Summer Term 2002 begins on Tuesday, June 17.

The last day of class is on Friday, August 22.

Final examination period is from Monday, August 25 to Friday, August 29.

Labor Day is observed on Monday, September 1.

Note: CSU policy states, "The typical academic year shall consist of 147 instructional days ... plus or minus 2 days is permissible. There shall be a minimum of 170 academic workdays in the academic year." Please refer to Academic Calendar Norms and Definitions.

SUMMARY OF CALENDAR DAYS

	Summer 2002	Academic Year (fws)		
		Fall 2002	Winter 2003	Spring 2003
Beginning Year/Term - WOW	--	5	--	--
MWF Days	29	29	28	29
TR Days	19	21	20	20
Total Qtr Instructional Days	48	50	48	49
Exams	5	5	5	5
Commencement	--	1	--	1
Grades Due Day	--	1	--	--
Total Qtr Academic Work Days	53	62	53	55

Total Academic Year Instructional Days (F-W-Sp) = 147

Total Academic Year Work Days (F-W-Sp) = 170

-21-
PROPOSAL #1 – JUNE 2002 TO JUNE 2003 ACADEMIC CALENDAR – SUMMER 2002 TO SPRING 2003

JUNE 2002						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

JULY 2002						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

AUGUST 2002						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

SEPTEMBER 2002						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

OCTOBER 2002						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

NOVEMBER 2002						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

DECEMBER 2002						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

JANUARY 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

FEBRUARY 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	

MARCH 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

APRIL 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

MAY 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

JUNE 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

JULY 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

AUGUST 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

Legend for Shading

	Academic Holiday
	Final Examination Period

Proposal #2 - Fall term begins Sept. 16; classes, Sept. 23

ACADEMIC CALENDAR for 2002-2003

SUMMER TERM 2002

June 18	Tuesday	Beginning of university year Beginning of summer term - classes begin
July 1	Monday	End of second week of instruction Last day to drop a class
July 2	Tuesday	Last day to add a class Last day to register late and pay late registration fee
July 4	Thursday	Academic holiday - Independence Day
July 9	Tuesday	End of third week of instruction - Census date
August 6	Tuesday	End of seventh week of instruction
August 23	Friday	Last day of classes
August 26-30	Monday-Friday	Final examination period
August 30	Friday	End of summer term
August 31-September 15	Saturday-Sunday	Academic holiday

FALL TERM 2002

September 16	Monday	Beginning of fall term (faculty only)
September 23	Monday	Fall term classes begin
October 4	Friday	End of second week of instruction Last day to drop a class
October 7	Monday	Last day to add a class Last day to register late and pay late registration fee
October 11	Friday	End of third week of instruction - Census date
November 8	Friday	End of seventh week of instruction
November 11	Monday	Academic holiday - Veterans' Day
November 27-December 1	Wednesday-Sunday	Academic holiday - Thanksgiving
December 6	Friday	Last day of classes
December 9-13	Monday-Friday	Final examination period
December 14	Saturday	Mid-Year Commencement
December 15-January 5	Sunday-Sunday	End of fall term Academic holiday

WINTER TERM 2003

January 6	Monday	Beginning of winter term - classes begin
January 17	Friday	End of second week of instruction Last day to drop a class
January 20	Monday	Academic holiday - Martin Luther King, Jr. Birthday Observed
January 21	Tuesday	Last day to add a class Last day to register late and pay late registration fee
January 27	Monday	End of third week of instruction - Census date
February 17	Monday	Academic holiday - George Washington's Birthday Observed
February 25	Tuesday	End of seventh week of instruction
March 14	Friday	Last day of classes
March 17-21	Monday-Friday	Final examination period
March 21	Friday	End of winter term
March 22-30	Saturday-Sunday	Academic holiday

SPRING TERM 2003

March 31	Monday	Beginning of spring term - classes begin
April 11	Friday	End of second week of instruction Last day to drop a class
April 14	Monday	Last day to add a class Last day to register late and pay late registration fee
April 18	Friday	End of third week of instruction - Census date
May 16	Friday	End of seventh week of instruction
May 26	Monday	Academic holiday - Memorial Day observed
June 6	Friday	Last day of classes
June 9-13	Monday-Friday	Final examination period
June 14	Saturday	Commencement
June 15-16	Sunday-Monday	End of spring term End of university year (faculty only) Academic holiday

SUMMARY OF CALENDAR DAYS

	Summer	Academic Year (fws)		
	2001	Fall 2001	Winter 2002	Spring 2002
Beginning Year/Term - WOW	--	5	--	--
MWF Days	29	30	28	29
TR Days	19	21	20	20
Total Qtr Instructional Days	48	51	48	49
Exams	5	5	5	5
Commencement	--	1	--	1
Total Qtr Academic Work Days	53	62	53	55

Total Academic Year Instructional Days (F-W-Sp) = 148

Total Academic Year Work Days (F-W-Sp) = 170

**Proposal #2
Summer 2002 - Spring 2003**

Considerations for the June 2002 to June 2003 Academic Calendar

Summer Term 2002 (48 instructional days)

Summer term begins Tuesday, June 18.
Independence Day falls on Thursday, July 4.
There is a 16-day break between the end of summer term and the beginning of fall term.

Fall Term 2002 (51 instructional days)

Fall term begins on Monday, September 16.
Instruction begins on Monday, September 23.
Veterans' Day is observed on Monday, November 11.
Thanksgiving holiday is observed Wednesday, November 27 through Sunday, December 1.
There is a 22-day break between the end of fall term and the beginning of winter term (3 weeks).

Winter Term 2003 (48 instructional days)

Winter term begins on Monday, January 6.
Martin Luther King's birthday is observed on Monday, January 20.
Washington's birthday is observed on Monday, February 17.
The last day of class is Friday, March 14.
There is a 9-day break between the end of term and the beginning of spring term.

Spring Term 2003 (49 instructional days)

Spring term begins on Monday, March 31.
Memorial Day is observed on Monday, May 26.
The last day of class is Friday, June 6.
Final Examination Week is from June 9 to 13.
There is a 2-day break between the end of spring term and the beginning of summer term.

FYI - Summer Term 2003 (48 instructional days)

Summer Term 2002 begins on Tuesday, June 17.
The last day of class is on Friday, August 22.
Final examination period is from Monday, August 25 to Friday, August 29.
Labor Day is observed on Monday, September 1.

Note: CSU policy states, "The typical academic year shall consist of 147 instructional days ... plus or minus 2 days is permissible. There shall be a minimum of 170 academic workdays in the academic year." Please refer to Academic Calendar Norms and Definitions.

SUMMARY OF CALENDAR DAYS

	<u>Academic Year (fws)</u>			
	Summer	Fall	Winter	Spring
	2002	2002	2003	2003
Beginning Year/Term - WOW	--	5	--	--
MWF Days	29	30	28	29
TR Days	19	21	20	20
Total Qtr Instructional Days	48	51	48	49
Exams	5	5	5	5
Commencement	--	1	--	1
Total Qtr Academic Work Days	53	62	53	55

Total Academic Year Instructional Days (F-W-Sp) = 148
Total Academic Year Work Days (F-W-Sp) = 170

-24-
PROPOSAL #2 – JUNE 2002 TO JUNE 2003 ACADEMIC CALENDAR – SUMMER 2002 TO SPRING 2003

JUNE 2002						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

JULY 2002						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

AUGUST 2002						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

SEPTEMBER 2002						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

OCTOBER 2002						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

NOVEMBER 2002						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

DECEMBER 2002						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

JANUARY 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

FEBRUARY 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	

MARCH 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

APRIL 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

MAY 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

JUNE 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

JULY 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

AUGUST 2003						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

Legend for Shading

	Academic Holiday
	Final Examination Period

HR 95-09

ATTACHMENT I

ACADEMIC CALENDAR NORMS AND DEFINITIONS

To provide for the orderly development of campus academic calendars, which are both responsive to local needs and consistent throughout the system, the Chancellor's Executive Council has adopted a number of "norms" and definitions. These are to be used in developing all academic calendars. The basic principle governing academic calendars throughout the system is that differences from campus to campus should be rationally based. They should not simply be chance occurrences.

NORMS:

Typical Year - The typical academic year shall consist of 147 instructional days. From year-to-year and from campus-to-campus a variation of plus or minus two days is permissible.

Minimum Workdays - There shall be a minimum of 170 academic workdays in the academic year.

Maximum Workdays - There shall be a maximum of 180 work days in the academic year, pursuant to the Unit 3-Faculty MOU (Article 20.3).

DEFINITIONS

Instructional Day - Any Monday through Friday during regular academic terms when class meetings are scheduled on a regular and extensive basis for the purpose of instruction.

Examination Day - Any day which is set aside for the exclusive purpose of administering final examinations for the term. When comparing campus calendars institutions that integrate all or part of examination activity with regular instruction will be presumed to have four examination days per term. 8 DAYS MAXIMUM MAY BE SCHEDULED.

Registration Day - Any day during the academic year during which faculty are on duty for the purpose of advising, orientation, course enrollment, and similar activities. For purposes of counting work days, registration days which are also instruction or examination days will not be included a second time.

"Other" Day - Any day during the academic year when faculty are on duty for such purposes as faculty and departmental conferences committee meetings, faculty development activities, etc.

Grades Due Days - Any day(s) prior to or at the close of the term which is designated specifically for the purpose of turning in final grades. This day must be included when computing total academic workdays. Campuses that schedule grades due over several dates may count up to two days per semester or one day per quarter as academic workdays. Prefer one day.

Evaluation Day - Days which are set aside for the reading of examinations and papers and for submission of final grades. A maximum of one day per term maybe scheduled.

Commencement- Any day set aside for graduation ceremonies. Commencement is counted as an academic workday only if faculty participation is expected and normal, and if the day is not otherwise credited as an academic day. Campuses with school commencements extending over several days may count one day in computing total academic workdays.

Academic Workdays - The total of all of the above which occur (between the beginning and ending dates of the academic year.)

Academic Holiday - Any day (Monday through Friday) occurring between the beginning and ending of the academic year which is so designated by the President. Except by special arrangement, faculty are not expected to be on duty during academic holidays.

Faculty Vacation - The period from the end of one academic year to the beginning of the next when all continuing academic year faculty are on vacation status, except for those scheduled to teach in summer quarter or for those on duty by other special arrangement. For faculty taking a quarter off in exchange for summer quarter teaching, the period extends from the end of the quarter preceding the quarter taken off to the beginning of the quarter succeeding the quarter taken off.

Adopted: November 24, 1998

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

AS-511-98/IC
RESOLUTION ON

THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR: RESOLVING CONFLICTS WITH RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS

WHEREAS, C.A.M. section 481.B.1 states, "Whenever possible, the first day of instruction in each quarter will be Monday with a 48 day minimum per quarter (49 day minimum spring) and whenever possible the last day of instruction each quarter will be a Friday;" and

WHEREAS, The first Monday in the academic calendar for Fall Quarter occasionally falls on the significant holidays of Rosh Hashanah or Yom Kippur; and

WHEREAS, California state law stipulates that public institutions of higher education make every effort possible to accommodate observance of religious holidays; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to stay within the required number of Instructional Days and Academic Year Work Days; be it therefore

RESOLVED: That in calendar years in which the first Monday of Fall Quarter falls on Rosh Hashanah or Yom Kippur, that instruction will begin on the Tuesday of that week; and be it further

RESOLVED: That during these same calendar years, minimum Academic Year Work Days will be maintained by extending the Fall term by one day, which will be noted as a "Grades Due" day but will not be an instructional day.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
November 16, 1998

Adopted: November 12, 1996

RECEIVED

DEC 06 1996

VICE PRESIDENT
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

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

AS-467-96/IC
RESOLUTION ON
THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR: FIRST DAY OF INSTRUCTION

WHEREAS, C.A.M. section 481.B.1 states, "Whenever possible, the first day of instruction in each quarter will be Monday with a 48-day minimum per quarter (49-day minimum, spring) and whenever possible the last day of instruction each quarter will be Friday"; and

WHEREAS, In recent years, including 1996-97, this stipulation has not been incorporated in the planning of the Academic Calendar; and

WHEREAS, Failure to start winter quarter on a Monday results in three Monday holidays, which adversely affects scheduling and instruction; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That C.A.M. 481.B.1 shall be revised as follows:

Instructional days: The first day of instruction in each quarter shall be Monday with a 48-day minimum per quarter (49-day minimum, spring) and whenever possible the last day of instruction each quarter will be a Friday;

and, be it further

RESOLVED: That C.A.M. 481.B.1 shall be given higher priority in planning the academic calendar than sections 481.A.2 (end summer quarter before Labor Day) and 481.A.5 (end spring quarter before the second weekend in June); and, be it further

RESOLVED: That at the time of initial review of the Academic Calendar, the Provost may recommend, in consultation with the Academic Senate, a first day of instruction other than Monday.

Proposed by the Academic
Senate Instruction Committee
Proposed September 24, 1996
Revised October 14, 1996
Revised November 12, 1996

ARTICLE 33

HOLIDAYS

- 33.1 Faculty unit employees who are classified as "academic year" employees are entitled to all days designated in the campus academic calendar as academic holidays, or any other day designated by the Governor for a public fast or holiday. Such academic holidays shall not be compensable.
- 33.2 This Article shall not apply to a faculty unit employee whose classification indicates "Casual Employment Employee."
- 33.3 A faculty unit employee shall be entitled to a Personal Holiday which may be taken on one (1) day during the calendar year. If the faculty unit employee fails to take the Personal Holiday before the end of the calendar year, the holiday shall be forfeited. CSU and CFA shall endeavor to inform a new faculty unit employee of his/her Personal Holiday. Scheduling of the Personal Holiday shall be by mutual agreement of the faculty unit employee and the appropriate administrator.
- 33.4 Provisions 33.5 - 33.11 of this Article shall apply only to ten (10) month and twelve (12) month faculty unit employees.
- 33.5 The following paid holidays, except as provided in provision 33.7 below, shall be observed on the day specified.
- a. January 1
 - b. Third Monday in January (Martin Luther King Jr. Day)
 - c. July 4
 - d. First Monday in September (Labor Day)
 - e. Thanksgiving Day
 - f. December 25
 - g. Any other day designated by the Governor for a public fast or holiday.
- 33.6 The paid holidays listed in this provision shall be officially observed on the day specified unless they fall on a Saturday or Sunday, or are rescheduled by the President for observance on another day.
- a. Third Monday in February (Washington's Birthday)

- b. February 12 (Lincoln's Birthday)
- c. Last Monday in May (Memorial Day)
- d. Admission Day
- e. Second Monday in October (Columbus Day)
- f. November 11 (Veterans' Day)

33.7 Any paid holiday listed in this Article which falls on a Saturday shall be observed on the preceding Friday. Any paid holiday listed in this Article which falls on a Sunday shall be observed on the following Monday.

33.8 A faculty unit employee in pay status on the day a paid holiday is officially observed shall be entitled to their normal pay for that day. An employee on a leave of absence without pay or other non-pay status on a day a holiday is officially observed shall not be entitled to the holiday.

33.9 If a paid holiday falls on a scheduled workday during the faculty unit employee's vacation or within a period of absence chargeable to sick leave, the faculty unit employee will not be charged sick leave or vacation time.

33.10 A faculty unit employee who is authorized to work and works on the day a holiday is observed is entitled to a maximum of eight (8) hours holiday compensating time off (CTO). This provision provides the only conditions under which an employee may be compensated by holiday CTO. Such earned holiday CTO shall be scheduled by mutual agreement of the faculty unit employee and the appropriate administrator.

33.11 If the first working day of a new faculty unit employee is preceded by a holiday, the faculty unit employee shall not be entitled to the holiday.

ARTICLE 34

VACATION

34.1 The provisions of this Article apply only to faculty unit employees in classifications which indicate a ten (10) month or twelve (12) month work year.

State Of California



Memorandum

To: Myron Hood
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Doug Keesey
Chair, Senate Curriculum Committee

Date: October 19, 2000

Subject: Curriculum Committee's Response to Math Resolution

Copies: Senate Curriculum Committee, Jim Harris, Kent Morrison, Jim Mueller, John Harrington, Bob Cichowski, Sue McBride, Margaret Camuso

Jim Harris visited the Senate Curriculum Committee today, and explained that the intent of his resolution was to set in motion a process to study the possibility of raising the standards for mathematics at Cal Poly, both in terms of curriculum and resources. However, the resolution, as currently stated, uses language that seems to call for more than that: "Resolution to Raise the Standards for Mathematics at Cal Poly," "to prepare...a revision to the minimum mathematics requirements that adds a requirement for a four unit mathematics course..." and to "develop plans and allocate sufficient one-time resources so that said mathematics course can be developed." We believe that the resolution, as currently written, does not accurately reflect the intent of the proposer.

The majority of those responding to the resolution seem to have interpreted it as proposing that this additional math requirement actually be implemented. The Curriculum Committee does not support the implementation of this additional math requirement. For reasons, see the written statements from Liberal Studies, UCTE, the GE Area B/F Subcommittee, and the GE Committee, who do not support the resolution and who provide reasons for their opposition.

However, if the resolution can be interpreted more broadly as calling for further study—of the kinds of math classes offered at Cal Poly, of the kinds of math classes different majors are advised to take, and of the kinds and levels of teacher preparation in math—then some members of our Committee could see possible advantages to this further study. Should the Math Department's course in discrete math have been eliminated? Should the possibility of placing more emphasis on applied math, or math studied in the context of particular disciplines, be considered? At this time, we do not see the purpose of framing this possibility of further study in the form of a resolution to be brought before the Senate. However, we encourage faculty interested in doing this further study to meet and begin exploring whether there are issues of common concern and directions which they can agree to pursue.

State Of California



Memorandum

To: Myron Hood
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Doug Keeseey ~~DK~~
Chair, Senate Curriculum Committee

Date: October 19th, 2000

Subject: Math Resolution Responses

To help the Curriculum Committee in its discussion of Jim Harris's proposed Resolution to Raise the Standards for Mathematics at Cal Poly, I asked Bob Cichowski from Liberal Studies, Sue McBride from UCTE, Kent Morrison from the Math Department, Jim Mueller from the GE Area B/F Subcommittee, and John Harrington from the GE Committee to provide input.

Their responses are attached.

The Curriculum Committee meets today on the issue, and I will e-mail you the committee's response later this evening following the meeting.

Subject: Math Resolution

Date: Thu, 21 Sep 2000 19:53:32 -0700

From: rcichows@calpoly.edu

To: aholz@calpoly.edu, kmorriso@calpoly.edu

CC: cbrown@calpoly.edu, pdavidma@calpoly.edu, DWright@ctc.ca.gov,
Harris_James_G/cpslo_employeeel@degas.artisan.calpoly.edu, dkeesey@calpoly.edu,
bkonopak@calpoly.edu, McBride_Susan_L/cpslo_employeeel@degas.artisan.calpoly.edu

Folks

Jim Harris has a resolution on Math requirements. He basically doesn't believe that pre-calculus algebra, statistics and 3 additional math classes is sufficient for LS or others entering the K-8 arena. We had a meeting last year (Doug called it) but he wasn't convinced.

Jim's statistics about California kids may be true but if every university asked for 5 math classes, the problem would be ameliorated. I am convinced that we produce the most well prepared candidates in the state wrt to math. I have had multiple exchanges with other LS programs and know this to be fact.

Your comments.

Bob

Math Resolution

Subject: Math Resolution

Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 15:31:26 -0700

From: McBride_Susan_L/cpslo_employeeel@degas.artisan.calpoly.edu

To: dkeesey@calpoly.edu

> Dear Doug,

The math issue is one we investigated and spent a great deal of time discussing at the initial level and throughout the discussions on the blended program curriculum. I remember the meeting when Jim Harris raised the question. I agree completely with the response from Bob Cichowski. I have attended many state meetings with other LS and Multiple Subjects faculty across the state. Our curriculum and our students do very well. There is no need to include more math studies in the curriculum.

Thanks for the opportunity for input.

Yours,

Sue McBride

Sue, Patricia, and Bob,

>

> The following Math Resolution has been referred to the Senate Curriculum,
> Committee for discussion and a recommendation. Before we talk, we would
> like to receive an official response to the resolution from UCTE and
> Liberal Studies--either separate responses or a joint response would be
> fine. If I could receive your response by Oct. 16, that would be very
> helpful.

>

> Thanks.

>

> Doug Keesey, Chair

> Senate Curriculum Committee

>

> Resolution to Raise the Standards for Mathematics at Cal Poly

Memorandum

San Luis Obispo, California 93407

Kem
To: Academic Senate Executive Committee Date: September 25, 2000
From: Kent Morrison, Math Dept. Chair Copies: Doug Keesey
Subject: Resolution to raise the standards for
 mathematics at Cal Poly

Cost of the proposal: 8000 SCU/year is reasonable using an estimate of about 2000 students taking the proposed class each year. These would be 1800 new students each year (freshmen and transfers) primarily in liberal arts and agriculture and 200 students repeating the class. Math classes like this average 30 SCU/WTU. This would require 300 WTU, which means 7.4 FTEF (1 FTEF = 36 WTU). At an estimated cost of \$75,000 for salary and benefit the total cost would be about \$555,000/year. A second way to estimate the cost is to note that total instructional payroll in mathematics is about \$3,000,000 for 1500 WTU. The additional 266 WTU (an increase of 18%) at the same average cost would add \$530,000 in payroll. Such a substantial increase in the size of the instructional faculty would require additional staff and operating expenses. Either way we arrive at an estimate of more than \$500,000/year.

Beyond high school mathematics: The proposal treats pre-calculus (Math 118) as high school level mathematics. Much of the content of this course used to be called "college algebra," and it was commonly taught as a freshman course to engineering and science students until the 1960's when it moved to the high schools. The CSU admissions requirements do not require pre-calculus but only three years of high school mathematics, typically algebra I, geometry, algebra II.

Mathematics for future teachers: The increasing mathematical needs for teachers are for teaching algebra in grades 6, 7, and 8. The curriculum for the liberal studies major reflects that emphasis with the requirement of Math 118, 327, 328, 329.

State of California

San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

MEMORANDUM

To: John Harrington, Director
General Education

Date: October 10, 2000

From: Jim Mueller, Chair
GE Area B/F Subcommittee

Copies: Area B/F
Subcommittee

Subject: Resolution to Raise the Standards
for Mathematics at Cal Poly

The GE Area B/F Subcommittee does not recommend approval of Jim Harris' Resolution to Raise the Standards for Mathematics at Cal Poly. We have met with Dr. Harris to discuss his proposal, and though we feel that the goal of raising standards is laudable and worthy of pursuit, we also feel that the implications and consequences of his resolution are problematic.

At the most fundamental level, his resolution creates an implicit entrance requirement to Cal Poly in the form of a course in precalculus. While it is true that precalculus algebra is taught at the high school level, it is also true that precalculus is currently not an entrance requirement to any CSU or UC school. Clearly, most students majoring in one of the hard sciences or engineering take precalculus in high school, and if their mathematics placement scores are high enough, these students will start in Math 141 and use calculus to satisfy their GE mathematics requirement. However, not all students take precalculus in high school, and many that do have a weak background in mathematics as evidenced by poor placement scores. If these students choose non-technical majors, we feel that it is appropriate to allow Math 118 as partial fulfillment of the GE requirement in mathematics.

In particular, we feel that Math 118 is an appropriate GE mathematics course for liberal studies majors. Recent trends in elementary education in California have pushed topics in algebra into grades 5, 6, and 7, and it we feel that it is extremely important that prospective teachers to be firmly grounded in this subject. Math 118 is the appropriate course to ensure appropriate content knowledge in algebra. It should be noted that Cal Poly has one of the most rigorous math education programs in the state. At Cal Poly, students seeking a multiple subject credential (appropriate for teaching grades K-8) are required to take five courses in mathematics and/or statistics. Other schools in California require only a year of mathematics. Should the Harris resolution pass, it is likely that liberal studies program will drop one of these courses, replacing it with a "higher level" course that will not be as useful for the teachers they hope to educate.

The committee also had concern that the Harris resolution "raises the bar" to a level that may be too high. Many weaker students struggle to satisfy the Math 118 requirement,

and the proposal to add a course in mathematics at a higher level may be too severe. The resolution effectively adds another four units of mathematics to the degree programs for many students on campus.

It appears to us that Dr. Harris is attacking the wrong end of the problem. If he wants to raise standards, then his resolution should be to change the entrance requirements to Cal Poly. Doing so would send a strong message to the high schools that mathematics is important, and college-bound students need to take math every year in high school.

State of California

San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

MEMORANDUM

To: Doug Keesey, Chair, Academic
Senate Curriculum Committee

Date: 10/11/00

From: John Harrington, Director
General Education Program

Copies: David Conn
Jim Mueller

Subject: Resolution to Raise the Standards
for Mathematics at Cal Poly

In September, you asked that the General Education Committee review the Resolution to Raise the Standards for Mathematics at Cal Poly. In turn, I asked the Area B/F Committee to prepare a recommendation for the GE Committee. The GE Committee supports the attached recommendation of the Area B/F Committee.

In addition to the specific points found in the recommendation of the Area B/F Committee, the GE Committee raised the following concerns:

- As approved by the Provost and the President, the current standards have established that "...a full review of the GE Program should take place two years after implementation (scheduled for Fall, 2001) and that no changes should be made in the template until then." We believe that the proposed change affects the template as approved by the Senate and the President, and that any proposed changes should await the review in 2003.
- Regardless of the timing of the review, we do not believe that there is adequate time to implement this decision by 2003, as called for in the resolution.
- A change in standards will likely affect transfer students and students who undertake either partial or area certification elsewhere. Consequently, wider consultation is needed before considering such a change.
- The Committee wanted to know whether evidence exists establishing that current graduates are not appropriately proficient in mathematics.
- The resolution will most significantly affect students from CLA. The new template already calls for CLA students to take an additional course in Area B.

Resolution to Raise the Standards for Mathematics at Cal Poly
Submitted by James G. Harris, CENG Academic Senator
25 July 2000

1. Whereas, K-12 students in the state of California rank near the bottom of the 50 states in standardized math and science testing scores, and the United States ranks in the middle of the developed nations in K-12 math and science testing scores; and
 2. Whereas, a review of the undergraduate programs at Cal Poly show that approximately half of the programs (most in the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Agriculture) require only the satisfaction of Math 118, and that over half of those programs defer to the GE&B area B requirements for satisfaction of college graduation requirements in mathematics; and
 3. Whereas, the current GE&B Area B.1 requirements establish a lower bound of eight course units for a Cal Poly graduate's knowledge of mathematics for graduation, of which four units can be statistics, knowledge that is normally not taught in high school; and
 4. Whereas, the mathematical knowledge and skills covered in Math 118 are taught in required high school courses; and
 5. Whereas, there are few mathematics courses in the catalog that require the material in Math 118 as a prerequisite other than those that teach calculus; and
 6. Whereas, it is recognized that increasing the level of mathematical knowledge and skills will raise the standards of the required education in science for Cal Poly graduates; and
 7. Whereas, raising the minimum standards of knowledge in math and science for Cal Poly graduates has the potential of raising the standards of excellence for those entering the teaching credential programs for K-12 education; and
 8. Whereas, it is recognized that there will require additional resources to develop new required mathematical courses and to teach these courses in addition to those now needed by our entering students; and
 9. Whereas, it is recognized that Cal Poly is a leader in undergraduate technical education in the state and nation, and that the standards required for our graduates can be a model for other CSU campuses; and
 10. Whereas, the attached white paper has been reviewed by a meeting of interested parties including faculty of UCTE, Liberal Studies and the mathematics department, by the GE&B area B subcommittee, by the curriculum committee of the College of Liberal Arts, and by the chair of the curriculum committee of the College of Agriculture, and has been made available to all chairs of programs within the Colleges of Agriculture and Liberal Arts and to the members of Academic Senate; be it
- A. Resolved: That the Academic Senate charge the GE&B area B committee to prepare by the end of this academic year a revision to the minimum mathematics requirements that adds a requirement for a four unit mathematics course that presents knowledge

beyond that currently taught in high school, and that those courses need not necessarily be based upon the calculus; and be it further

B. Resolved: That the Academic Senate request that the President and Provost develop plans and allocate sufficient one-time resources so that said mathematics courses can be developed, and allocate sufficient operational resources so the said mathematics courses will be operationally available for students by Fall 2003; and be it further

C. Resolved: That the Provost and the Chair of the Academic Senate Curriculum committee make reports at least once per quarter to the Academic Senate on the progress of the implementation of this resolution.

White Paper on Mathematics Requirements for Cal Poly Graduates

James G. Harris, 10/18/99

Based upon remarks at Academic Senate on October 5, 1999

Numerous publications have documented that K-12 students in the United States score well below students in other nations in math and science in standardized tests (the tests are a point of controversy). To further exacerbate the situation, K-12 students in California rank near the bottom of the states in standardized tests on math and science. Ironically, after four (or five) years of college, the US undergraduates graduating in Math, Science and Engineering are the envy of the world. It has been stated that Cal Poly is enrolling better students every year if entering GPA and test scores are used as the measure of comparison. In summary, K-12 students in California do not fare well in their understanding of math and science from a national perspective, and fare even worse from an international perspective. However, Cal Poly graduates in the mathematics, science and engineering disciplines have a good reputation amongst their peers in the national and world community.

It is with this background that I made my remarks concerning the GE&B mathematics requirements at the Academic Senate meeting on October 5, 1999. These remarks were provoked by the name change proposed for MATH 327, 328, and 329 from Introduction to Modern Mathematics, Introduction to Modern Mathematics, and Mathematical Applications to Elementary Teaching to Mathematics for Elementary Teaching I, II, and III, respectively. This sequence of courses requires a prerequisite of MATH 118, Pre-Calculus Algebra, a course which consists of material covered in high school, and the name change fairly represents the objectives of the course.

A study of the math requirements for the undergraduate programs at Cal Poly shows that graduates of over half of the approximately 60 degree programs can graduate having taken only MATH 118. Furthermore, over half of these programs defer to the GE&B area B requirements for the satisfaction of college graduation requirements in Mathematics. Most of these programs are administered within the Colleges of Agriculture and Liberal Arts. It is noted that these graduates represent the largest pool of future K-12 teachers within Cal Poly.

The GE&B area B.1 requirements establish an lower bound of eight course units for a Cal Poly graduate's knowledge of mathematics upon graduation. These eight units can consist of both Mathematics and Statistics courses. Statistics normally is not taught in high school, and therefore, can be considered college material. Therefore, assuming a student enrolls in one four unit Statistics course, the issue being discussed is the requirement for one four unit Mathematics course. The proposition is that this single four unit course should contain knowledge beyond a high school proficiency in college preparatory mathematics, i.e., a course that requires Math 118 as a prerequisite.

This proposed increase in the minimum level of mathematical content for graduation from Cal Poly presents at least two major problems. The first problem is that there are no freshman year, or sophomore year, courses with a MATH prefix that require only MATH 118 as a prerequisite other than the calculus, or courses based upon the calculus. Courses in discrete mathematics, mathematical knowledge for the foundation for computation if you will, are no longer available; MATH 124, Finite Mathematics, is no longer offered in the catalog, and CSC 141, Discrete Structures, is taught in the Computer Science department, and requires CSC 102, Fundamentals of Computer

Science II, as a corequisite. The second problem is that this increase in the minimum level of mathematical proficiency for Cal Poly graduates will require additional resources to be allocated for implementation. To illustrate this second problem, assume that half of the incoming freshman satisfy their mathematics course requirement with MATH 118. This means that approximately 2000 students will have to take one additional four unit MATH course, about 8000 SCUs, or about 60 sections for 240 WTUs, or, for the sake of argument, say four faculty positions. An estimate of the cost is therefore approximately \$300K per year, plus expenses to develop the new courses in discrete mathematics.

Again, the goal of raising the minimum standard for the mathematical proficiency of the Cal Poly graduate is to produce better candidates for entering the K-12 teaching profession. Raising the level of mathematical proficiency also will allow a more rigorous treatment within the lower division science courses, which should allow these courses to raise their standards for the students. This proposal is submitted with the faith that entering Cal Poly freshman will rise to the challenge of the higher standard, and with the prediction that eventually through the improved preparation of K-12 teachers, the mathematics and science education of K-12 students, and especially elementary students, will be improved. The proposal also will enhance Cal Poly's reputation for leadership in undergraduate education for publicly supported colleges and universities.

FROM: Academic Senate CSU Constitutional Review Committee (Jack Bedell, Harold Goldwhite [chair], Allison Heisch, Jacqueline Kegley, and Robert Kully)

TO: Campus Senates

DATE: September 15, 2000

SUBJECT: **Campus representation on the Academic Senate CSU**

The Constitutional Review Committee has been asked by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate CSU to examine the question of representation of campuses on the Academic Senate (Article II, Section I of the current Constitution). It would greatly assist the work of the committee if you and your Executive Committee would give your informal opinions about this section, including such matters as:

1. Are large campuses underrepresented?
2. Would a larger Academic Senate CSU be more representative of disciplines, ethnic backgrounds, etc.?
3. Would increasing the size of the Senate improve or diminish the effectiveness and efficiency of problem solving debates and discussions?
4. Is the Academic Senate CSU's work currently being performed adequately with the present number of senators?
5. Has your Senate changed its size or composition recently? If so, what has been the impact on workload, output, diversity, etc.
6. Are you aware of any studies on size versus effectiveness of governance organizations?

Please send your reply to the committee (constitution@calstate.edu) by Friday, October 27.

Thank you.

Article II Section 1 of the current Academic Senate CSU Constitution:

Membership

The Academic Senate shall consist of 51 elected campus representatives as follows:

(a) one senator from each campus with an FTEF of 100 or less, two from each campus with an FTEF of over 100, one extra senator for as many campuses as possible apportioned on the basis of the highest FTEF; (b) the immediate past chair of the Academic Senate if not an elected member; (c) the Chancellor or representative as an ex-officio non-voting member. The immediate past chair of the Academic Senate if not an elected member shall not be counted as a campus representative.

Academic Policy and Planning Committee

Distance Education Policy

Approved by SDSU Senate on April 6, 2000

Definition:

For the purposes of this policy, distance education is defined as a formal educational process in which the majority of the instructional interaction occurs when student and instructor are not in the same place. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous.* Distance education may include correspondence, audio, video, or computer technologies. This policy shall apply to all credit-bearing courses and programs offered through distance education by San Diego State University, including those offered as Special Sessions through the College of Extended Studies.

Guidelines:

The following guidelines shall apply to new distance education courses and programs, as well as to existing courses and programs in which the method of delivery has changed significantly from that approved in the original curriculum proposal leading to that course, certificate or degree. Any department or faculty group offering distance education programs (those in which more than half of the courses are offered through distance education) is expected to meet Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) requirements and be guided by policy established by the University. In addition, a department or faculty group is expected to address, in its self-studies and/or proposals for institutional change, the following expectations, which will be reviewed by the University and perhaps by the regional accrediting commission.*

Principles:

The following basic principles have been articulated:

1. While the University prizes academic freedom and wishes to encourage innovation in instruction, the

faculty also has a collective responsibility to ensure the academic quality and integrity of the University's courses, programs, and degrees. This responsibility extends to those courses and programs offered through distance education.

2. Faculty and students have a right to know the modes of delivery and technological requirements of each course, program, and degree offered by the University. Students shall have access to this information before enrolling in a course or program.
3. Distance education programs and courses shall be consistent with the educational mission of the College and the University.
4. Tenured or probationary faculty shall direct any culminating experience or capstone of a distance education program.
5. Each program shall provide the opportunity for substantial, personal, and timely interactions between faculty and students and among students.
6. The proportion of tenured and probationary faculty teaching in a distance education program shall approximate that of the campus-based program.
7. Admissions criteria shall be comparable for students on and off campus.
8. Financial plans for program delivery and student participation shall be pre-approved.
9. Students shall have adequate access to library and student services.
10. The university shall offer appropriate training and support services to faculty who teach distance education courses and programs.
11. Distance education is an optional mode of instruction. Nothing in this policy shall imply that distance education is a preferred or required mode of instruction.

Implementation:

These eleven principles shall be applied in the following ways:

1. Curriculum and Instruction:

- a. In the curricular review process, distance education programs shall demonstrate that they provide the opportunity for substantial, personal, and timely interactions between faculty and students and among students.

- b. One-on-one mentoring with a tenured or probationary SDSU faculty member associated with the program is required for a graduate culminating experience.
- c. The faculty of the program assumes responsibility for and exercises oversight over a distance education program, ensuring both the rigor of the courses and program and the quality of instruction.* This includes:
 - i. The selection and evaluation of formally approved adjunct and/or part-time faculty.
 - ii. Maintaining approximately the same ratio of tenured/probationary faculty to adjunct and/or part-time faculty in the distance learning program as in the campus-based program.
 - iii. Ensuring that the technology used suits the nature and objectives of the courses and program.*
 - iv. Ensuring the currency of materials, courses, and program.*
 - v. Ensuring the integrity of student work and the credibility of the degrees and credits the University awards.* It is the responsibility of the faculty to ensure that reasonable safeguards are in place to prevent academic dishonesty.
- d. Ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues, and the utilization of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, telecourses, or other media products shall be agreed upon by the faculty and the University (in accordance with the SDSU Intellectual Property Policy) prior to the initial offering of a course or program.
- e. No individual, program, or department shall agree in a contract with any private or public entity to deliver distance education courses or programs on behalf of SDSU without prior university approval from the Office of Graduate and Research Affairs.
- f. The university shall not agree in a contract with any private or public entity to deliver distance education courses or programs without the prior approval of the relevant department or program.
- g. Agencies providing funding for special certificates or degree programs or courses shall not acquire any privileges regarding the admission standards, academic continuation standards or degree requirements for students or faculty attached to a university-approved academic program.

2. Evaluation and Assessment:

- a. The Graduate Council Curriculum Committee or the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall review all distance education courses and programs, even if the curriculum is largely derived from existing campus-based courses or programs. When distance education proposals are to be considered by either committee, it shall be expanded to include three non-voting, ex-officio experts in distance education selected by the Committee on Committees: one from the faculty, one from the instructional technology staff, and one from the administration. Distance education programs shall also be reviewed by those committees charged by policy with curricular program review.
- b. The method of delivery for new courses and programs shall become part of each curriculum proposal, to be reviewed under the normal curricular process.

c. Any significant change in the method of delivery for existing courses or programs shall be submitted as a course change proposal, to be reviewed by the Graduate Council Curriculum Committee or the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. When such a proposal is to be considered by either committee, it shall be expanded in the way described above under 2.a.

d. The Academic Review process shall be used to evaluate the educational effectiveness of distance education courses and programs (including assessments of student based learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction), and when appropriate, determine comparability to campus-based programs.* This process shall also be used to assure the conformity of distance education courses and programs to prevailing quality standards in the field of distance education.

e. A review and approval of all distance education courses and programs, including those initially approved by their colleges, shall begin immediately and conclude within two years of the implementation of this policy. This review shall follow the normal process specified in the policy file.

3. Library and Learning Resources:

The program administrators shall provide evidence in the curricular proposal that:

- a. Students have adequate access to and support in the use of appropriate library resources;*
- b. Students have access to laboratories, facilities, and equipment appropriate to the courses or programs.*

4. Student Services and Admissions:

The program administrators shall provide evidence in the curricular proposal that:

- a. Students are provided adequate access to the range of student services appropriate to support the program, including admissions, financial aid, academic advising, delivery of course materials, and placement and counseling;*
- b. Students are provided with an adequate means for resolving student complaints;*
- c. Students are provided advertising, recruiting and admissions information that adequately and accurately represents the program's requirements and services;*
- d. Students who are admitted possess the knowledge and equipment necessary to use the technology employed by the program;* and
- e. Technical advice is available to students to resolve hardware and software problems.*

5. Facilities and Finances:

The program administrators shall provide evidence in the curricular proposal that:

- a. University standards are followed in setting course-loads per instructor and/or academic unit.
- b. The program or department possesses or has access to the equipment and technical expertise required to deliver distance education courses and programs.*
- c. The long-range planning, budgeting, and policy development processes reflect the facilities, staffing, equipment and other resources essential to the viability and effectiveness of the distance education course or program.*
- d. Any distance education program has received resource approval prior to commencing operation.

* The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) has developed guidelines for distance education. The guidelines are an extension of the Principles developed by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. The SDSU policy outlined above reflects many of the WASC guidelines set forth as of 03/08/00. The language used in the WASC guidelines has been incorporated into this policy, when deemed appropriate, but has been adapted to reflect conditions at this University. For the text of the WASC guidelines, please refer to the WWW site of the WASC at <<http://www.wascweb.org/>>