

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

FILE COPY

Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, September 24 , 1996
UU220, 3-5:00pm

8.13.96 minutes were reviewed

- I. Minutes: Approval of the August 13, 1996 minutes (pp. 2-4).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
There will be a special Executive Committee meeting on Tuesday, October 1, from 3-5pm in UU220 to conclude discussions on (1) the position of Vice Provost for Institutional Planning, and (2) student enrollments for fall quarter '96. Please calendar this meeting.
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair:
 - B. President's Office:
 - C. Provost's Office:
 - D. Statewide Senators:
 - E. CFA Campus President:
 - F. Staff Council representative:
 - G. ASI representatives:
 - H. IACC representative:
 - I. Athletics Governing Board representative:
 - J. Other:
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. **Committees:**
 - 1. Academic Senate committee vacancies: (p. 5).
 - 2. University-wide committee vacancies: (p. 6).
 - 3. Academic Senate appointment to the IACC.
 - 4. Appointment of chair to the Curriculum Committee.
 - 5. Appointment of replacement member (for J Connely) on the GE&B Ad Hoc Committee.
 - B. **Resolution on 1996-97 Interim Performance Salary Step Increase Policy:** Harris, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 7-13).
 - C. **Resolution on The Academic Calendar: First Day of Instruction:** Freberg, chair of the Instruction Committee (p. 14).
 - D. **Resolution on Credit for Advanced Placement Exams:** Freberg, chair of the Instruction Committee, (p. 15).
 - E. **Resolution on Policy on Amorous Relationships:** Swartz, chair of the Status of Women Committee, (pp. 16-19).
 - F. **Resolution on Allocation of Cal Poly Funds:** Hood, chair of the Budget Committee, (p. 20).
 - G. **Resolution on Input into Campus Planning:** Greenwald, Academic Senate Chair, (p. 21).
 - H. **Resolution on Program Review and Improvement Committee's Findings for 1995-1996 programs reviewed:** Peck, former chair of the Program Review and Improvement Committee, (see separate document enclosed with this agenda).
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
- VII. Adjournment:

9.16.96

VACANCIES to Academic Senate committees

College of Agriculture

Fairness Board	VACANCY
Instruction	VACANCY
Status of Women	VACANCY

College of Architecture and Env Design

Budget and Long-Range Planning	VACANCY
Curriculum	VACANCY
Fairness Board	VACANCY
General Education & Breadth	VACANCY (B Kesner, G Smith)
Grant Review	VACANCY
Library	VACANCY (B Kesner)
Research and Prof Development	VACANCY (M White)

College of Business

Grant Review	VACANCY
Instruction	VACANCY

College of Engineering

Curriculum	VACANCY
Grant Review	VACANCY
Library	VACANCY

College of Liberal Arts

Curriculum	VACANCY
Faculty Affairs	VACANCY
Grant Review	VACANCY
Program Rev & Improvement	VACANCY

College of Science and Math

Grant Review	VACANCY
Instruction	VACANCY
Program Rev & Improvement	VACANCY

Professional Consultative Services

Grant Review	VACANCY
Instruction	VACANCY
Status of Women	VACANCY

VACANCIES to university-wide committees

Campus Planning	VACANCY (fall quarter '96 replacement for Donna Duerk)
Commencement	VACANCIES (CAGR,CAED)
Educational Equity Commission	VACANCIES (CAED,CBUS)
El Corral Advisory	VACANCY (ONE) (Jay Devore, Nan Farkye, Don Floyd)
Global Affairs Council	VACANCY (Colette Frayne, William Little)
Graduate Studies	VACANCY (CAED, CBUS, CSM)
Information Res Mgt Pol & Plg	VACANCY (ONE)
Instructional Adv Com on Computing	VACANCIES (CAGR)
Registration and Scheduling	VACANCIES (CAGR,CAED,CLA)
Resource Use	VACANCY (ONE) (Tim O'Keefe)
Student Health Adv Com	VACANCY (ONE)

Resolution on:

1996-97 INTERIM PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY

- WHEREAS, The faculty contract ("Unit 3 Memorandum of Understanding" or MOU) has created Performance Salary Step Increases ("PSSIs"); and
- WHEREAS, The MOU delegates to the Academic Senate on each campus the task of establishing standards, criteria, and procedures for granting such step increases; and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate enacted (on November 28, 1995) an interim policy on procedures, standards and criteria for the granting of PSSIs during the 1995-96 academic year and directed that the interim policy be reviewed and a more permanent policy be put in place by June 1, 1996 to apply for academic years 1996-97 and 1997-98; and
- WHEREAS, The Personnel Policies committee has reviewed the interim policy following the April 1, 1996 award of PSSIs by the President; therefore, be it further
- RESOLVED: The 1995-96 policy (as revised and attached) be extended for the 1996-97 PSSI cycle; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That each college/unit be required to elect a committee for the purpose of developing criteria by the end of Winter Quarter 1997 to evaluate PSSI applications, and such criteria shall be reviewed by the appropriate deans and approved by the Provost. Furthermore, these approved criteria be applied in PSSI cycles beginning in 1997-98.

Proposed by
Personnel Policies committee
May 14, 1996

M:\...pssi\PPC2pssi.res

1996-97 PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY

This policy is considered interim for the ~~1996-97~~ 1995-96 academic year. ~~It shall be reviewed and monitored by the appropriate Academic Senate committee during 1996 Winter and Spring Quarters.~~ A permanent policy shall be considered by the Academic Senate prior to the conclusion of Spring Quarter ~~1997~~ 1996.

1.0 Performance Salary Step Increases

1.1 Performance Salary Step Increases (PSSIs) recognize outstanding or meritorious performance in the areas of teaching performance and/or other professional performance, professional growth and achievement, and service to the University, students, and community. (MOU 31.17)

1.2 The recognition of outstanding or meritorious performance by a Unit 3 employee shall be in the form of a permanent increase in the base salary of the individual, in one or more steps on the salary schedule. (MOU 31.18)

1.3 ~~During academic year 1995/96 no candidate shall receive more than four (4) PSSIs. In 1996/97 and in any future year n~~ No candidate shall receive more than five (5) PSSIs. (MOU 31.18)

1.4 The effective date of all PSSIs shall be ~~in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement~~ January 1 of each year that there are negotiated PSSIs. (MOU 21.11)

2.0 Eligibility and Criteria

2.1 All Unit 3 employees are eligible each year to submit an application or to be nominated by other faculty or academic administrators for PSSIs.

2.2 Applicants/nominees are to be evaluated in the following areas: teaching performance and/or other professional performance; professional growth and achievement; and service to the university, students, and community.

2.3 The performance of applicants/nominees is expected to be outstanding in the area of teaching performance (or other professional performance for librarians, coaches, and student services professional-academic related) and at least meritorious in either of the two remaining areas. Applicants will identify which areas ~~aside from teaching performance~~ they consider their performance to be outstanding and/or meritorious.

2.4 For the purposes of this document, the following working definitions shall apply.

Outstanding: exceptional performance; superior to others of its kind; distinguished, excellent; readily acknowledged as a model for other faculty to follow.

Meritorious: deserving of reward or praise; cooperative and productive work with colleagues.

2.5 The following areas are examples of the kinds of information applicants/nominees may submit, appropriately validated, as evidence of their performance in each area. Applicants/nominees shall not be limited to the following types of evidence:

AREA I: TEACHING PERFORMANCE and/or OTHER PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE (when addressing teaching performance, applicants may, but are not required to, included examples of course syllabi, samples of examinations, description of innovative pedagogy and/or traditional modes of instruction, summary of quantitative student evaluation for past two years along with grade distribution for classes that were evaluate, and basis for used for grading students).

(PPC2psi.res: 5/14/96)

- teaching effectiveness recognized by peers and/or students;
- curriculum development and application of innovative and effective teaching methods and materials including such activities as development of new courses, programs, majors, or degrees;
- scholarship of teaching (see Cal Poly Strategic Plan, Section 2);
- performance of professional responsibilities by librarians, counselors, or coaches.
- techniques that show excellence in teaching.
- evidence of significant professional development as it relates to teaching excellence.
- evidence of significant scholarly activity as it relates to the subject taught.

AREA II: PROFESSIONAL GROWTH and ACHIEVEMENT

For a full description of the following kinds of activities, see "Cal Poly Strategic Plan", Section 2, and Administrative Bulletin 85-2, "Role and Definition of Professional Growth and Development."

- activities in the scholarships of teaching, discovery, integration, and application (see Strategic Plan);
- activities in professional growth and development as defined in AB 85-2.

AREA III: SERVICE TO UNIVERSITY, STUDENTS AND COMMUNITY

- participation in university governance at the department, college/division, university or CSU levels.
- participation, as an advisor or mentor, in student organizations;
- involvement in diversity-related activities;
- involvement, e.g. by presenting talks, organizing colloquia, or service as an officer, in the work of community groups related to one's teaching/professional area;
- involvement with the K-12 community provided that these activities go beyond those required in the faculty unit employee's normal instructional program and are related to one's teaching/professional area;
- community-related service projects provided that these activities go beyond those required in the faculty unit employee's normal instructional program and are related to one's teaching/professional area.
- participation in governance and committees of the exclusive bargaining agent (CFA).

3.0 Application

3.1 The period emphasized for outstanding or meritorious performance is five academic years immediately preceding the academic year in which submission of the application/nomination is made. It is the responsibility of the applicant to make a persuasive case for the recognition of these achievements. Applicants should describe in ten (10) or fewer pages (additional pages will be discarded) their vita, achievements and the significance of these activities, and examples of appropriate evidence. All documentation must be in writing (videos and communications requiring electronic access will not be considered).

3.2 Signed applications/nominations shall be submitted to the department chair/head. To go forward as an application to the College (Unit) PSSI Committee a nomination must have the approving signature of the nominee. The approving signature of the applicant/nominee authorizes access to their personnel action file to those involved in considering PSSIs. Only one application/nomination may go forward for any candidate.

3.3 Applicants/nominees shall provide the College (Unit) PSSI Committee with relevant documentation regarding outstanding or meritorious performance.

4.0 Review by College (Unit) and University PSSI Committees

4.1 Each department shall have the opportunity to select a tenured faculty member to serve on the College (Unit) PSSI Committee. For the purpose of considering PSSIs, coaches will be merged with the faculty of Physical Education and Kinesiology; and faculty unit employees from the Library, University Center for Teacher Education, and Counselors shall be combined into a single "Unit." Each college and the UCTE/Library/Counselor Unit shall select a tenured faculty member to serve on the University PSSI Committee.

4.2 Applications and nominations shall be forwarded to College (Unit) PSSI Committees consisting of tenured Unit 3 employees. No more than one Unit 3 employee from a department shall serve on the College (Unit) PSSI Committees except in cases where this would result in a committee of fewer than three people.

4.3 College (Unit) and University PSSI Committees shall review and categorize all applications. Three categories shall be used: highly recommended; recommended; not recommended. For those candidates recommended favorably, the College (Unit) and University PSSI Committees shall recommend the number of steps to be awarded. Applicants have seven calendar days after College or University PSSI Committee recommendation to provide a written rebuttal statement, not to exceed one page (supplemental documentation is not permitted), to respective committee chair with a copy to President.

4.4 Applicants for PSSIs shall not serve on College (Unit) or University PSSI Committees.

4.5 College (Unit) and University PSSI Committees shall inform all applicants of their recommendations at the time that they are forwarded.

5.0 Review by the President

5.1 All recommendations are forwarded to the President or his/her designee no later than March 15, 1996, and no later than December 1 of each year in which negotiated PSSIs are awarded in the future.

Failure to meet these deadlines for recommendations shall automatically result in the forwarding of all applications/nominations to the President for his/her award of PSSIs. (see MOU 31.27)

5.2 The President or designee shall review all of the applications/nominations which have been submitted, and select the recipients of the increases from among this candidate pool by April 1, 1996, and no later than January 1 of each year in which negotiated PSSIs are awarded in the future. He/she shall also determine the appropriate number of steps to be granted. (see MOU 31.28)

5.3 The decision to grant or deny an increase for meritorious performance, and the number of steps to be granted, shall not be subject to the grievance procedure. (see MOU 31.28 and Section 8, below). Only correspondence which documents information that a faculty member was granted PSSI(s) will be placed in a faculty members Personnel Action File.

6.0 Special Provisions (see MOU 31.29--31.31)

6.1 At least fifty percent (50%) of the candidates receiving a PSSI must have received a positive recommendation from the College (Unit) PSSI Committees provided that:

The College (Unit) PSSI Committees make a positive recommendation for enough candidates to fully expend the campus pool for PSSIs in that fiscal year and

The College (Unit) PSSI Committees meet the time requirement for the review and recommendations of all candidates to the President as specified above.

6.2 If the College (Unit) PSSI Committees submit fewer than the minimum number of positive recommendations needed to expend fully the pool for PSSIs in any fiscal year, then the percentage of candidates receiving a PSSI that must also have received a positive recommendation from the College (Unit) PSSI Committees shall be reduced proportionately from fifty percent (50%).

7.0 Relationship to RPT Deliberations

7.1 The decision to grant or deny a PSSI shall not be considered during deliberations regarding the granting of reappointment, promotion or tenure. This shall not preclude the consideration of any facts during RPT deliberations which are also considered during PSSI deliberations. (see MOU 31.35)

8.0 Peer Review of Performance Salary Step Denials (see MOU 31.36- 31.42)

8.1 Candidates who have received a favorable recommendation from the ~~College (Unit)~~ University PSSI Committee and who subsequently fail to receive a PSSI shall be eligible to have the increase denial reviewed by a University Peer Review Panel.

8.2 The University Peer Review Panel shall be selected by lot from among all full-time tenured faculty who did not serve on that year's College (Unit) PSSI Committees.

8.3 The President shall consider the University Peer Review Panel's recommendations and all forwarded materials and, no later than fourteen (14) days after receipt of the University Peer Review Panel's report, notify the affected employee and the University Peer Review Panel of his/her final decision, including the reasons therefor. Notification to the employee of the President's decision concludes the peer review procedure and such decision shall not be reviewable in any forum.

8.4 All requests for peer review must be submitted in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs no later than ~~April 15, 1996, and no later~~ than January 15 of each year in which negotiated PSSIs are awarded in the future.

9.0 Reporting of Awards

9.1 The University shall report to the Academic Senate annually by College (Unit) the appropriate aggregate statistics regarding the number of candidates in each category, the number of recipients and the number of steps granted.

PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE (PSSI)
APPLICATION / NOMINATION FORM

Name: _____

Department /
College (Unit): _____

Date of Application: _____

If applicable, nominated by: _____

The performance of applicants/nominees is expected to be **OUTSTANDING in the area of teaching performance** (or other professional performance for librarians, coaches, and student services professional-academic related) and at least meritorious in either of the two remaining areas. Applicants, please identify below which areas ~~aside from teaching/other professional performance~~ you consider your performance to be outstanding and/or meritorious.

<u>Outstanding</u>	<u>Meritorious</u>	<u>Area</u>
_____	_____	teaching performance and/or other professional performance
_____	_____	professional growth and achievement
_____	_____	service to the university, students, and community

Number of PSSI steps (range 1-5) applying for: _____

If applicable, date of last PSSI received and number of steps awarded: _____
(Date) (Steps)

It is the responsibility of the applicants to make a persuasive case for the recognition of these achievements. Applicants should describe in six (6) or fewer pages their vita, achievements and the significance of these activities. Please clearly specify which areas you are addressing. The period emphasized for outstanding or meritorious performance is five academic years immediately preceding the application. Applicants should describe in ten (10) or fewer pages (additional pages will be discarded) their vita, achievements and the significance of these activities. Please clearly specify which areas you are addressing. All documentation must be in writing (videos and communications requiring electronic access will not be considered). When addressing teaching performance, applicants may, but are not required to, include examples of course syllabi; samples of examinations; description of innovative pedagogy and/or traditional modes of instruction; summary of quantitative student evaluations for past two years along with grade distribution for classes that were evaluated; and basis used for grading students. The period emphasized for outstanding or meritorious performance is five academic years immediately preceding the application.

My signature certifies that the statements in this application are true and factual and authorizes review of my personnel action file by those involved in considering PSSIs. I understand that the PSSI committees reserve the right to request and review additional documentation.

Applicant's Signature _____ Date _____

1996-97 PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE CALENDAR

Applications/nominations provided directly to Department Chair/Head with a copy to President	October 1
Departments and Colleges (equivalent units) select representatives to serve on College and University PSSI Committees. Representatives are: --tenured Unit 3 employees --not being considered for PSSI	October 1-14
Last day for Department Chair/Head to forward signed signed application forms to College PSSI Committee	October 15
College PSSI Committees review applications, forward recommendations to University PSSI Committee and advise candidates of status: --highly recommended; number of steps --recommended; number of steps --not recommended	November 5
Applicant's rebuttal statement, if any, due to College PSSI Committee with copy to President	November 12
University PSSI Committee reviews applications, forwards recommendations to President and advises candidates of status --highly recommended; number of steps --recommended; number of steps --not recommended	**December 1
Applicant's rebuttal statement, if any, due to University PSSI Committee with copy to President	December 8
President makes award decisions	**January 1
Written requests for Peer Review due in Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office	January 15
Peer Review Panel(s) selected by lot	January 20
Peer Review Panel(s) forward findings and recommendations to President	February 19
President notifies affected employees and Peer Review Panels of final decisions.	March 5

**Dates mandated by collective bargaining agreement

Adopted:

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

**AS- -96/
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 a Friday;" and
- WHEREAS, In recent years, including 1996-1997, 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--~~Whenever possible,~~†The first day of instruction in each quarter ~~will~~ 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).

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
April 18, 1996

Adopted:

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

**AS- -96/
RESOLUTION ON
CREDIT FOR ADVANCED PLACEMENT EXAMS**

- WHEREAS, Incoming students with advanced placement credits are already among the best students admitted to the University. Their intellectual growth should be further stimulated and encouraged; and
- WHEREAS, It is common practice elsewhere in the California State University and University of California systems to provide students with specific course credit for advanced placement scores of 3 or higher; and
- WHEREAS, The Visionary Pragmatism report recommends that the University should "award credit towards completion of the program for all standardized advanced placement credit earned by the student with a test score of 3 or higher;" therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, That students shall receive specific course credit for all scores of 3 or above; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That departments shall identify specific major and GE&B course credits, rather than "free electives," for the AP exams relevant to their disciplines; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee will evaluate departments' advanced placement policies during the course of their normal review process.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
April 12, 1996

Adopted:

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

**AS- -96/
RESOLUTION ON
AMOROUS RELATIONSHIPS**

- WHEREAS, Faculty hold positions of authority that involve the legitimate exercise of power over others; and
- WHEREAS, Trust and respect are diminished when those in positions of authority abuse or appear to abuse their power; and
- WHEREAS, The issue of appropriate and inappropriate relationships between students and faculty is very complex; and
- WHEREAS, It is the responsibility of Cal Poly faculty to maintain the highest standards of professional ethics; and
- WHEREAS, Cal Poly's Faculty Code of Ethics and the AAUP's Statement on Professional Ethics affirm that (1) professors adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors, (2) they make every reasonable effort to assure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit, and (3) they avoid any exploitation of students; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That Cal Poly adopt the attached *Policy on Amorous Relationships Between Students and Faculty or Instructional Staff Who Evaluate or Supervise Them*.

Proposed by the Status of Women Committee
May 13, 1996

POLICY ON AMOROUS RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN STUDENTS AND FACULTY OR INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF WHO EVALUATE OR SUPERVISE THEM

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

May 10, 1996

I. POLICY STATEMENT: AMOROUS RELATIONSHIPS IN THE INSTRUCTIONAL CONTEXT

It is the policy of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo that faculty members or other instructional staff shall not initiate, pursue, or be involved in any amorous or sexual relationships (hereinafter referred to as amorous relationships) with any student whom they are in a position to evaluate or supervise by virtue of their teaching, research, or administrative responsibilities.

Friendships or mentoring relationships between faculty or instructional staff and students are not proscribed by this Policy, nor is it the intent of this Policy that such non-amorous relationships be discouraged or limited in any way.

Marital relationships are covered separately in the Campus Administrative Manual (Conflict of Interest - section 311.5).

II. RATIONALE FOR POLICY

The University's educational mission is promoted by professionalism in faculty-student relationships, and professionalism is fostered by an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. Actions of faculty or other members of the instructional staff that undermine this professionalism jeopardize the University's ability to fulfill its educational mission. Trust and respect are diminished when those in positions of authority abuse or appear to abuse their power.

Faculty members and other instructional personnel exercise power over students, whether in giving them praise and criticism, evaluating their work, making recommendations for their further studies or future employment, or conferring other benefits on them. Because it may easily involve or appear to involve a conflict of interest, an amorous or sexual relationship between a faculty member or other member of the instructional staff and a student entails serious ethical concerns when the faculty or instructional staff member has professional responsibility for the student.

Voluntary consent by the student in such a relationship is difficult to determine with certainty, given the fundamentally asymmetric nature of the relationship. Because of the complex and subtle effects of that power differential, relationships may well be less consensual than the individual

whose position confers power believes, and the faculty or instructional staff member bears a special burden of accountability in any such involvement.

Further, amorous or sexual relationships in which one person is in a position to review the work or influence the career of another may provide grounds for complaint by others outside the relationship when that relationship appears to give undue access or advantage to the individual involved in the relationship, or to restrict opportunities, or create a hostile and unacceptable environment for those outside the relationship. Other students and faculty may be affected by behavior that makes or appears to make obtaining benefits (such as advancing one student over others) contingent on amorous or sexual favors.

III. DEFINITIONS

As used in this Policy, the term "faculty member" or "instructional staff" means any member of the university community who engages in instructional or evaluative activities of any student who is enrolled in a course being taught by that individual or whose academic work, including work as a teaching or research assistant, is being supervised or evaluated by that individual. Graduate or undergraduate students, when performing official University academic supervisory or evaluative roles with respect to other students, are considered instructional staff for the purposes of this Policy.

As used in this Policy, an amorous relationship exists when, without the benefit of marriage, two persons as consenting partners (a) have a sexual union or (b) engage in a romantic partnering or courtship that may or may not have been consummated sexually.

As used in this Policy, to "evaluate or supervise" means:

- a. To assess, determine or influence (1) one's academic performance, progress or potential or (2) one's entitlement to or eligibility for any instructionally conferred right, benefit or opportunity, or
- b. To oversee, manage or direct one's academic or other institutionally prescribed activities.

IV. AMOROUS RELATIONSHIPS OUTSIDE THE INSTRUCTIONAL CONTEXT

Amorous relationships between faculty members or other members of the instructional staff and students occurring outside the instructional context may also lead to difficulties. Particularly when the individual and the student are in the same academic unit or in units that are academically allied, relationships that the involved parties view as consensual may be disruptive to unit activities and appear to others to be exploitative. Further, in these and other situations, the faculty or instructional staff member may face serious conflicts of interest. In any such situation, therefore, faculty or instructional staff members should be most careful to remove themselves from involvement with any decisions that may reward or penalize the student.

V. PROCESS AND SANCTIONS

Because of the sensitive nature of such relationships, every reasonable effort should be made to resolve alleged Policy violations on an informal basis if possible. Concerns about problems related to this Policy may be taken to the administrative official most directly involved, excluding the person alleged to have violated this Policy, or to one of the individuals listed below in Section VIII.

Any remedial actions taken through informal procedures by the administrative official most directly concerned, excluding the person alleged to have violated this Policy, will depend on the totality of the circumstances. Efforts should be made to be constructively educational and to be corrective rather than punitive if a Policy violation is found: an acknowledgment of the violation and a commitment not to violate the Policy in the future, along with a warning or other appropriate action directed toward the faculty or other instructional staff member, may be sufficient resolution. In cases where further action is deemed appropriate, sanctions may range from a letter of reprimand to dismissal, all in accordance with applicable University procedures.

VI. APPEALS

If not satisfied with the administrative official's decision, the faculty member or other member of the instructional staff accused of a Policy violation may proceed, in accordance with established procedures, to the grievance or hearings committees to which he or she otherwise has access.

VII. ABUSE OF THIS POLICY

Complaints found to have been intentionally dishonest or made in willful disregard of the truth may subject the complainant to disciplinary action, with possible sanctions ranging from a letter of reprimand to dismissal.

VIII. RESOURCES FOR ASSISTANCE AND INFORMATION

Questions concerning this Policy may be addressed to the University's Director of Affirmative Action (756-2062), Women's Program/Student Life and Activities (756-2476), the Sexual Harassment Advisors (names and numbers are available from Director of Affirmative Action), the Vice President of Student Affairs (756-1521), and the Vice President of Academic Affairs (756-2186).

Copies of the Policy are available from Department Chairs and from the offices listed above. These offices are also prepared to help people understand what the Policy means and what options for resolution are available if they believe they have experienced a problem related to this Policy in connection with their academic study or work at the University.

IX. This policy is effective on and after June 1, 1996.

Adopted:

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

**AS- -96/
RESOLUTION ON ALLOCATION OF CAL POLY FUNDS**

- WHEREAS, Current State funding does not provide sufficient funds to maintain the quality of education at Cal Poly while allocating the budget as it has been done in the past; and
- WHEREAS, Cal Poly will have a new source of additional funding, should the Cal Poly Plan concept be adopted; and
- WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Plan and the Cal Poly Strategic Plan identify the mission, objectives, and goals for maintaining quality education at Cal Poly into the 21st century; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly community of students, faculty, staff, and administration should work diligently to achieve those goals and accomplish those objectives; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the allocation of Cal Poly funds should be explicitly based on those goals and objectives; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That measures for the assessment of the ability of programs to meet the goals and objectives be in place before funds are allocated to those programs; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That all funded programs be given an adequate base support over a reasonable period of time to obtain their objectives; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the University community work together in an interdisciplinary spirit to determine those areas which will receive additional funding above the base support; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That those areas receiving funding above the base support level be given sufficient funding to allow them to make significant progress toward meeting their goals; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That those programs receiving additional funding share the information learned from their experiences with the rest of the University community; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate or its designee(s) participate in the development of the budget policies and of budget models, and have continuing input into the distribution of the Academic Affairs' budget.

Proposed by the Budget Committee
April 30, 1996

Adopted:

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

**AS- -96/
RESOLUTION ON
INPUT INTO CAMPUS PLANNING**

- WHEREAS, Broad dissemination of information concerning campus planning is essential; and
- WHEREAS, Timely dissemination of information concerning campus planning is essential; and
- WHEREAS, Broad campus input into campus planning is essential; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate representation on the Campus Planning Committee be increased from one to two representatives; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the agenda of the Campus Planning Committee be posted at least seven days in advance of any meeting of the Campus Planning Committee both electronically and at specified locations on the campus; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the current Five Year Capital Outlay Program be available in the University Library; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That monthly reports be made available in the University Library on the status of major capital outlay projects in progress; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That CEQA documents associated with projects in progress be made available in the University Library; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That discussions of proposed campus projects be at the earliest formative stage when presented to the Campus Planning Committee; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That provisions be made for conducting open forums on campus planning issues upon request from members of the campus community; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That a yearly report be made by the Campus Planning Committee to the Academic Senate regarding major outlay projects.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Executive Committee
April 30, 1996