FILE COPY

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

Meeting of the
Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, September 23, 1997
UU220, 3:00-5:00pm

all minutes were approved

I. Minutes: **Approval of the Executive Committee minutes for** April 15, April 17, May 6, May 13, July 16, 1997. **Approval of the Academic Senate minutes for** November 12, November 19, November 26, 1996, January 14, February 18, March 4, March 18, April 8, April 22, April 29, May 27, June 3, and June 10, 1997 (pp. 3-52).

II. Communication(s) and announcement(s):
- A. **All electronic mail is being sent to your OpenMail account. If you do not have an OpenMail account, mail will be directed to your UNIX account. However, if you have a UNIX account and an OpenMail account, Academic Senate communications will automatically be sent to your OpenMail account.**
- B. The Academic Senate is now on the World Wide Web. Information regarding meetings, agenda, minutes, etc. can be viewed at *http://www.calpoly.edu/~acadsen*.
- C. **Draft copy (6.19.97) of Office Space Allocation Policies and Priorities:** (pp. 53-55).
- D. **Final Report of the Task Force on Distance Education:** (pp. 56-69).

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. **Appointments to the Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee:** three Executive Committee appointments (a combination of new and incumbent representatives) are needed to this committee.
- B. **Appointment to the IACC:** an Executive Committee member is needed to represent the Academic Senate on this committee.
- C. **Academic Senate committee vacancies:** (p. 70).
- D. **University-wide committee vacancies:** (p. 70).
- E. **Revisions to the *Cal Poly Performance Salary Step Increase Policy:*** (pp. 71-77).

F. **Resolution on the 1997-1998 Budget:** Hood, Chair of the Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee (p. 78).

G. **Resolution on Faculty Governance of Mode of Instruction:** Laura Freberg, Chair of the Instruction Committee (p. 79).

H. **Resolution on the Search Process and Qualifications for the New CSU Chancellor:** Executive Committee (pp. 80-81).

I. **Resolution on Faculty Professional Conduct:** Harris, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 82-83).

J. **Resolution on Evaluation of Academic Deans:** Harris, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (p. 84).

K. **Resolution on Faculty Input for Writing Job Description for academic administrators:** Harris, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (p. 85).

VI. Discussion item(s):
Academic Senate committees: term limits for Academic Senate committee members.

VII. Adjournment:

RECEIVED

SEP 5 1997

Academic Senate

State of California

Memorandum

CAL POLY
SAN LUIS OBISPO
CA 93407

To: Campus Space Advisory Committee

via e-mail

Date: June 19, 1997

From: Linda C. Dalton, Vice Provost for Institutional Planning, X 2186

Robert Kitamura, Director, Facilities Planning, X 2581

Copies: K. Ikeda
J. Henricks
K. Stubberfield

Subject: Office Space Allocation Policies and Priorities

As a second follow-up to the Campus Space Advisory Committee meeting on June 18, we are forwarding the revised Office Space Allocation Policies and Principles.

While most of the principles focus on faculty office assignments, as they are the most subject to change from year to year, these principles should be applied to other office uses as appropriate. Faculty are generally defined as those individuals who are represented by Unit 3 (which includes full-time librarians and student services professionals along with instructional faculty).

Encl.

Office Space Allocation Policies and Principles

DRAFT (revised June 19, 1997)

Part I. General Principles to Determine Office Space Capacity, Location, and Allocations Campus-wide

1. Office space assignments should be related to the overall (rated) capacity and quality of the space. Offices in temporary buildings (such as Modoc) should not be included as capacity in the inventory.

2. Several years ago, the campus reached an agreement with the Chancellor's Office that all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty should have one-person offices. We need clarification regarding the implications of this agreements on how to calculate office space capacity. The preliminary space inventory material distributed on May 28, 1997, provides a tally of one and two-person offices by college.

3. Faculty offices should be located in close proximity to the appropriate departmental office, or primary teaching location. This principles also respects the college "zones" that have been established previously.

4. State-funded positions/activities are higher priority than non-state funded (e.g., sponsored research, other foundation activities, etc.). The historical ratio was one faculty office per FTEF used.

5. The group agreed to analyze minimum office space needs based on Fall faculty assignments, as follows: Total tenured and tenure-track faculty and full-time lecturers (head count); plus Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) used for part-time lecturers and teaching associates. (Fifteen Weighted Teaching Units/quarter is the basis for calculating FTEF for part-time faculty.) We agreed to note the part-time head count as well. Institutional Studies will provide additional data for Fall 1996 for reference.

6. Some discussion addressed how the University might reassign office space in the future so that colleges with relatively more part-time faculty could have access to larger offices to accommodate these individuals in groups. This issue was left unresolved.

7. Annual adjustments in office assignments need to be made early in Spring Quarter, based on the previous Fall usage and projected needs for the subsequent Fall. The University might identify some relatively "neutral" buildings with offices whose assignments would be flexible from year-to-year (not assigned permanently to any college). The group agreed that Building 38 would be appropriate for this purpose.

8. Departmental and program office space needs need to be addressed separately from faculty offices. Nevertheless, these issues are related, esp. when a large department lacks sufficient support staff space, or a new program is created. New programs within a college should be accommodated within space already assigned to that college. Space needs should be addressed for interdisciplinary or university-wide programs when such programs are proposed and under review.

Part II. Principles for Office Space Assignments within Colleges/Units (Colleges/Units should not request additional office space from the University without examining possible reassignments within college space, applying the following principles.)

A. For spaces rated for one person, use the following priorities:
   1. Tenured and tenure-track faculty
   2. Full-time lecturers (and volunteer or visiting faculty with full-time teaching assignments)
   3. Faculty who are involved full-time with a department, although the teaching assignment may be part-time with assigned time for other activities such as sponsored research.

B. Space rated for two or more persons (not department offices), should not be assigned to one person alone, but rather to multiple persons, as follows: (Exceptions may be made where necessary to satisfy other needs and past agreements. However, please see Part I, #6, regarding the need to balance larger office spaces among colleges to accommodate part-time lecturers.)
   1. Part-time lecturers
   2. Teaching associates
   3. Teaching assistants

4. Research projects (funded with higher priority than not funded)
5. Graduate students conducting independent research

C. Administrative and support staff should be considered for office space, as follows:
   1. Administrators, full-time advisers, or other full-time professional and support staff requiring privacy/confidential appointments merit private offices (state-funded with higher priority).
   2. Other support staff, clerical employees, and student assistants should be accommodated in department, college, or division space.
   3. Technicians may have specialized space needs.

D. Faculty on-leave or emeriti should not occupy office space, unless engaged in voluntary activities that contribute to their academic program and/or university business. One suggestion would be for the University to provide a common lounge for emeriti with a telephone and computer access.

E. No faculty member should be assigned more than one office, although s/he may be engaged in research activities at another location. The group raised a concern about security for research materials if a second office is not available.

F. The following activities should not occupy spaces classified as private offices (whether rated for one or more persons), as they should be accommodated in department, college or division space.
   1. Student assistants
   2. Conference room
   3. Reference room
   4. Faculty, staff or student lounge

G. Student clubs should not occupy spaces classified as offices.

H. The following activities should not occupy spaces classified as offices (but may use substandard enclosed spaces -- i.e., those that are too small for an office).
   1. Copy room
   2. Mail room
   3. Storage

Members of the Campus Space Advisory Committee:

Susan Currier	Paul Rainey
Bob Kitamura	Roxy Peck
Linda Dalton	Preston Allen
Kimi Ikeda	Debbie Arseneau
Phil Doub	Kathy Lamoree
Dick Zweifel	
Jerry Cunico	
Norm Johnson	

State of California

CAL POLY
SAN LUIS OBISPO

Memorandum

To: Members, Task Force on Distance Education*

Date: September 4, 1997

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

Cc: Warren J. Baker
Harvey Greenwald
Anny Morrobel-Sosa
Deans' Council Members
William Boldt
Juan Gonzalez
Frank Lebens

Subject: Final Report of the Task Force

I am pleased to acknowledge receipt of the final report of your work on "Distance/Distributed Education." I have read it with great care and feel that it will inform the larger campus discussion on these matters. Your own debate about what to call the object of your study – distance education, distributed learning – underscores the complexity of issues that accompany it. They are ideological, pedagogical, political, and cultural and reflect Diana Oblinger's and Mark Maruyama's observation in their fine monograph, DISTRIBUTED LEARNING (1996) that "all faculty do not perceive technology as neutral...[for] it represents the 'disconnect' many educators feel between their own background and training and the current needs of society."

Several aspects of your report, in particular, strike me as critical chords of emphasis as Cal Poly considers future plans, initiatives, and investments in distance/distributed education. We should always place in context – that is, our educational mission and its strategic expressions – what we seek to do and we should always build on our established strengths. Moreover, we should be willing to explore new means to fulfill our mission, carefully considering the promise of new ventures with the realities of established good practices. As you have affirmed, technology is not an end in and of itself – it is just one of several means to achieve institutional goals and objectives that are appropriate to our mission. This is a point that cannot be made too often, especially as higher education faces a future characterized not only by physical locations centered around libraries and faculty to which students come to learn, but also where the student is considered to be the "center" of learning and instruction increasingly will be delivered to them wherever <u>they</u> may be.

Your report acknowledges the challenges of this future and your recommendations should be carefully considered as we engage it. Again, thank you for the time you devoted to this work and the energy and perspectives you brought to it. I will be pleased to share this report with the President and his management

staff, deans, the Academic Senate, and others on our campus who will benefit from its findings and observations.

*Distribution
Paul Adalian (University Library)
Carol Barnes (Dean, Extended University Programs and Services)
Nancy Clark (History Department)
Robert Clover (ITS Support Services and Instructional Support)
Barry Floyd (College of Business)
Tom Fowler (Architecture Department)
Laura Freberg (Psychology/Human Development Department)
Joseph Grimes (Computer Science Department)
Peggy Lant (English Department)
Roxy Peck (College of Science and Mathematics)
Doug Piirto (Natural Resources Management Department)
Norm Rogers (Extended University Programs and Services)
Dan Walsh (College of Engineering)

interoffice
MEMORANDUM

to: Dr. Paul Zingg, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs

cc: Task Force Members

from: Carol E. Barnes, Chair, Task Force on Distance Education Committee *Carol E. Barnes*

re: Final Report of the Task Force

date: May 23, 1997

Paul:

Enclosed is the final report of the Task Force on Distance Education. This document represents a year of time and effort on the part of the Task Force Members (listed at the end of this memorandum) and I have every appreciation for the work all of them did. The faculty and staff on the Task Force spent many hours discussing "distance education, distance learning, distributed learning," and all the ramifications of each of these areas. At the end of these discussions, we agreed that we could not come to clear concensus on a definition of these terms, but we all agreed that Cal Poly needs to move forward in the utilization of high technology for course preparation and delivery. The means of delivery is much less of a concern than the accomplishment of new and innovative ways of presenting course content through whatever medium seems most appropriate. In this process, Cal Poly should focus on what it does well and enhance those strengths--remaining keenly aware of the quality of education. In addtion, a final recommendation of the Committee is that the campus does need to move forward and that funding of innovation and development of classroom materials is crucial.

This document represents a beginning and will need to be revisited periodically and updated as decisions are made on the paths to follow in the future. It is not intended to answer all the questions, but to raise issues which need to be answered in the not too distant future.

from the desk of...

Carol E. Barnes
Dean
Extended University Programs and Services
Jespersen Hall
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

805-756-2053
Fax: 805-756-5933

Table of Contents

CONTENT	PAGE
Executive Summary	**2**
Definition of Distance/Distributed Education	**3**
State of the Campus	**5**
Concerns and Challenges	**6**
Organizational Structure	**8**
Accountability and Assessment	**9**
Recommendations	**10**

Appendices (Subgroup reports)

- **A. Distance Learning: A Definition**
- **B. State of the Campus**
- **C. Concerns, Challenges, Advantages, Disadvantages, Arguments Pro and Con for Investing in Distance Education**
- **D. Organizational Structure and Definition**
- **E. Accountability and Assessment**
- **F. Distance Education Task Force Members**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
TASK FORCE ON DISTANCE/DISTRIBUTED EDUCATION

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Paul Zingg appointed the Task Force on Distance Education on 19 September 1996 "to help the University understand where it is, and where it should be going, regarding distance education. Specifically, I am asking the task force to conduct a needs assessment for distance education at Cal Poly and, if it concludes that a need exists, to develop a series of recommendations to help the University chart an appropriate course."

By the close of the twentieth century, the explosion in information and communication technologies had created vast opportunities for the dissemination of education throughout the world. Telephonic, computer and visual technologies such as audiobridges, compressed video, digital fiber optic networking, telewriters and the World Wide Web present exciting and effective means to connect teachers and learners at a distance.

Cal Poly's educational mission, as stated in the University Strategic Plan (January 1996) and the Cal Poly Plan (June 1996), focuses on institutional productivity, student learning and progress, educational quality, and accountability and assessment. The University Strategic Plan specifically calls for the exploration of "alternative educational models and technologies to enhance the quality and quantity of the services it provides to its students and other constituencies, including business and industry." And the Cal Poly Plan, which attempts to anticipate solutions to future problems of increasing demand and limited public resources, aims to decrease student time to degree, increase student learning, enhance productivity, promote effective use of fixed resources and implement comprehensive assessment measures and accountability processes.

As a polytechnic institution, Cal Poly should be on the forefront of technological innovation. Many forms of experimentation with new technologies and course delivery methods should be explored and evaluated. Distance/distributed education can provide a means to bring educational resources to Cal Poly as well as a means to disseminate information from Cal Poly to other sites around the world. Distance/distributed education means that a full spectrum of course offerings could be available to faculty and students any time, any place. A wide range of possibilities exist for expanding the traditional credit offerings as well as enhancing consulting and research exchanges of knowledge. Distance technology can provide the capability to shift the time of instruction via the Internet, the World Wide Web and email. In short, it could mean education on demand.

The Task Force divided the questions posed by Provost Zingg into five areas and formed subcommittees to examine these issues. They are:

1. Definition of Distance/Distributed Education
2. State of the Campus
3. Concerns and Challenges
4. Organizational Structure
5. Accountability and Assessment

The full subcommittee reports are attached as appendices.

Definition of Distance/distributed education

Before we can define distance learning, it is important to place our explication within the context of the educational paradigm under which we now operate. With respect to this paradigm, all education may be described as distributed learning or distributed education.

We make this claim because even in a very traditional educational setting, teaching and learning occur in a wide range of situations. We learn in class, in lab, at home, in the library, on the bus, in the studio; we teach in the immediate presence of our students, but we also teach when students read our comments on their papers, remember our words, think about our assignment, follow our instructions in the library, the lab, the museum, the studio. Education even in the most traditional sense never has, then, been confined to the classroom. Formal education has always been distributed across a wide range of human experiences; as teachers, we take full advantage of these many distributed modes of teaching and learning.

If all education is, in fact, distributed occurring across a range of possibilities, one of these educational situations must include those learning situations which take place at a distance. These educational experiences may be called distance learning, by which we mean any learning and teaching effort in which a temporal or spatial distance separates student, instructor, and class. Such teaching and learning may be accomplished by means of several media: written correspondence, television and video transmission, networked electronic communication, and electronic media such as CDs and educational software. Because communications media are developing so rapidly in our time, we believe that the list of means by which education may occur at a distance can be neither exclusive nor exhaustive. In addition, these new technologies add to the stock of pedagogical tools for use by teacher-scholars.

Institutions of various kinds have started to offer education at a distance. Some exist as commercial ventures, designed to step in where public and private institutions are falling behind. Given the high cost of education and the difficulty for some learners to enroll in residential programs, these companies propose to provide the education that our nation's colleges and universities cannot. Such enterprises include the National Technology University, established to educate technology professionals, Greenleaf University (a Ph.D. granting on-line university), and the Globewide Network Academy which provides a service to instructors as well as organizations and universities who wish to offer courses and degree programs on the World Wide Web. Clearly, as these opportunities become more accessible to potential students, "distance" will become less of a concern.

These institutions are serving the growing market of non-traditional students and lifelong learners for whom residential college education may be impossible or inappropriate. Many employees need additional education and training to keep up with changes in their fields or to switch to alternative fields of employment. In addition, many residential students may be drawn to distance/distributed education courses due to scheduling conflicts or temporary relocation on a co-op project.

Examples of distance/distributed learning efforts may include:

- A sociology class might meet in a classroom several days a week even as it includes an on-line website for enrichment or employs an electronic mailing list for discussion.
- A history class might be offered completely on-line by means of a class website, or it might be offered using the class website as a component embedded in a series of video presentations.
- A math class may be built on a CD which includes interactive components for solving math problems.
- A module on accounting might be offered to workers at a company by means of video-conferencing.

- A real-time computer science class in Alaska might be team taught with an instructor in a real-time computer science class in Bangkok with the classes sharing problems, discussions, and resources by means of the web or by means of email.
- An art class might be offered by means of video that is used by students as the information is needed

The State of the Campus: Current Efforts at Distance/Distributed Education

According to a sampling of courses in each college, current efforts at Distance/distributed education break down into two groups: (a) traditional classroom instruction distributed to other campuses/sites and (b) on-campus instruction via computers including e-mail communication, interactive documents, web research, video presentations and entirely computer based delivery courses (MATH 100 and 104). [Information concerning individual courses may be found in Appendix B.]

.Personnel in various departments were contacted and they in turn contacted their respective faculty and staff personnel to respond to questions concerning courses taught and faculty reactions. Most faculty involved in developing and delivering distance/distributed education courses at Cal Poly believe that there are significant benefits for students and faculty. In particular, they believe both teaching effectiveness and course content are enhanced through increased access to information as well as improved presentation of material through multimedia resources. Students are getting more information in more accessible formats. Furthermore, instruction can reach a varied audience including non-Cal Poly students as well as Cal Poly students participating in field internships off campus.

There have also been a number of reported problems/challenges experienced by faculty engaged in distance/distributed education. Those faculty sending courses off campus have had problems dealing with technology while also concentrating on their material. They need more training, technical assistance (technicians), and a clear organizational unit with which to work. In addition, concerns have been expressed that there is a loss in student understanding, especially in the larger classes.

Faculty involved with computer-based courses for students on campus complain of inadequate computer resources on campus, including software, computer-based classrooms and a general unreliability of the campus computer network.

All faculty polled expressed a desire for greater funding, training facilities and incentives for faculty to become involved in distance/distributed education.

A brief pilot survey was conducted to determine whether students would be receptive to the use of various forms of technology to replace a portion or all of the lecture component of a course. In general, the students were more receptive to using technology to replace a portion of the lecture than to replace the entire lecture component of the course. Among four types of delivery mentioned in the survey—computer, Internet, video conferencing, and video tapes—there did not seem to be a preference for one over another

Concerns and Challenges

The primary challenges for Cal Poly in distance/distributed education are:

1. Defining its role at the University.
2. Shifting the developmental emphasis from production to pedagogy.
3. Encouraging the consensus and cooperation of relevant on-campus constituencies.
4. Committing the necessary baseline resources to the program.

Concerns over distance/distributed education come from a broad range of constituencies. Most importantly, some faculty are concerned that the technology associated with distance/distributed education interferes with or adversely affects the quality of instruction and learning taking place. They are also concerned that such technology is being imposed upon them in an effort to reduce faculty numbers while increasing student enrollments. In addition to faculty, some students perceive distance/distributed education as a cost-saving ploy for colleges which provides an inferior education to the student. And outside academe, cultural analysts such as journalists perceive technology as either overly deterministic (undermining humanistic values) or as a powerful tool for social control.

Given these concerns, the relationship between pedagogy and technology constitutes a potentially volatile and divisive issue. Those who are not convinced that education can benefit by the use of technology should be assured that the institutions and practices they value are not threatened by new teaching and learning strategies. In point of fact, many of these same faculty are using forms of technology such as the overhead projectors, slides, printed texts to name a few. On the other hand, those who wish to attempt new modes of effective teaching through the use of instructional technology must be supported in their explorations.

Thus, a dynamic but pedagogically sound relationship between teaching and technical resources should be defined. Any teaching strategy must ultimately serve some learning goal. Whatever resource an instructor employs--chatroom, class lecture, quiz, website--must be evaluated at some point with respect to its effectiveness in fostering learning. The key phrase here is "at some point." Many argue that the use of technology in teaching must be undertaken only AFTER a teaching goal has been set. Others would say that we discover NEW teaching goals only after we have attempted--sometimes with only a mere glimmer of what we hope to gain--to use a specific resource, that using a new resource might change, restructure, or fundamentally alter our pedagogical goals. This opinion supports the view that a faculty member should retain the right to say, "I am not quite sure what I can do with a chatroom, but I am willing to give it a try and see what happens."

The caveat is that "at some point" sound teaching practices and carefully articulated pedagogical goals should be brought to bear upon both the process and the outcome of a new teaching strategy. Good teaching and effective learning are our goals. This precept might be applied at the beginning of any experiment in education. But this precept might also be held in temporary abeyance while we explore the possibilities of new teaching and learning resources.

A consideration of the changing nature and needs of society, advances in learning and cognitive theory, and the realities of pedagogical research and experiences could help meet many of these concerns. In particular, most research conceives of distance/distributed education as part of a systematic, learner-oriented educational design rather than as a technology tacked on to current instructional models. The technology involved with distance/distributed education may facilitate individualized instruction geared toward the student, his/her learning style, competencies, habits and pace. Selecting the specific technology to be used should be based on the determination of desired learning outcomes: whether or not learning is to produce cognitive, behavioral, affective, motor skilled related outcomes; whether or not independent or cooperative learning is most appropriate;; whether face-to-face activities are essential; whether instruction must be conducted in real-time. When employed, distance/distributed education should become an integral component of education, co-existing with traditional forms of instruction. It can produce assessable learning outcomes within the appropriate mix of teaching strategies.

A most compelling challenge at Cal Poly is to promote a more global understanding of the issues involved in the design and implementation of distance/distributed education. The potential advantages that are extended to learners of all groups and abilities through distance/distributed education include empowerment, personal success, mobility, multicultural awareness, professional development, learner-centered content and control. As an example, for individuals with mobility impairments use of the Internet allows more access by negating potential hurdles of elevators, parking spaces, and steep, narrow pathways.. Delivery methods need to be carefully planned to allow access for students with all kinds of disabilities—including those with speech impediments and those with sight difficulties. However, in general, distance education classes are generally more accessible for the disabled. From the University's perspective distance/distributed education could enhance its ability to provide education within Cal Poly's service area as well as providing special expertise to students outside the service area.

Proposed Organizational Structure for Distance/Distributed Education

The task force subgroup undertook an informal survey of other institutions in the CSU which provide distance delivery locally and statewide to determine the scope of organizational structure. Within the CSU, most of the distance education operations report to the Extended Education or Continuing Education Dean and follow a campus-wide approval process which includes the Academic Senate at each institution. (See appendix for details of other campus programs.)

The existent levels of distance education can be understood through the use of a typology described by Michael Mark (1990) in his analysis of institutional structures and effectiveness of American distance learning. The first and most common level is the "distance learning program" which has been called "the craft approach." At this level, random faculty at schools involved in traditional classroom instruction choose to add distant learners to a conventional class. In a "distance learning unit, " a separate unit exists within a conventional college, university, or school system which is dedicated to distance learning activities. It has its own administrative staff and sometimes faculty. A "distance learning institution, " exists for the sole purpose of providing distance education to its students. The roles and responsibilities of faculty and staff are different from those in a traditional environment. The "distance learning consortium," includes NTU, NUTN and the "Star Schools," all of which are examples of this form of collaboration in distance education.

It should be recognized that distance/distributed education is not necessarily applicable to all subjects and all skills in all disciplines and that a discipline specific faculty mentoring program is essential for the success of distance/distributed education. Mentoring should take place at the department, or at least the college, level with a designated faculty member available to work with individuals and groups. A basic curriculum for faculty professional development could also be available through the various existing facilities on campus: Instructional Technology Service, Faculty Development Office, Faculty Media Development Center and the Kennedy Library. Each department should consider recognition of such faculty activities in evaluation for retention, tenure and promotion.

Any comprehensive definition of distance/distributed education must take into account the coordination of all facets of off-campus delivery including but not limited to admissions, registration, advisement, financial aid, instructional design, faculty development, instructional materials, delivery and outcomes assessment.

Any organization of distance/distributed education should include services to facilitate faculty participation in the development and delivery of courses on a voluntary basis. Distance/distributed education technologies must enhance student learning and should include faculty training in instructional design as a key component.

Accountability and Assessment

Faculty want to know that the efforts demanded by new technologies will result in improved pedagogy. Students should find their education not only relevant but also enriched and accessible. And Cal Poly should continue to enjoy a reputation within the state as well as among our peer institutions for high quality education. Regulation of distance/distributed education can help to assuage doubts and ensure the credibility of our institution.

Faculty concerns are widespread and focus primarily on quality of education. In particular, many worry that new methods of instruction are less effective and will increase faculty workload to the point where contact between teacher and student will be seriously impaired. There are already a number of guidelines and procedures in place which address these issues with regard to all courses on campus, including Distance Education. There are also gaps, as a result of changing technology and budgetary considerations, which should be closed. Quality of education may be addressed through consideration of Curriculum Review procedures.

All courses offered at Cal Poly must be approved at 3 levels of faculty review - departmental, college, and university. At present, there is no review process specific to distance/distributed education courses, whether individual courses or at the program level. Guidelines and procedures which already exist should be implemented and consideration should be given to designation of distance/distributed education as a separate instructional mode.

Procedures for determining faculty workload within Distance/Distributed Education should be formulated. How is contact via computer or video measured versus contact within the classroom? How does web activity equate with lecture or seminar activity? Should increased student numbers be counterbalanced by decreased face-to-face contact?

Continuity with established standards and procedures will help to allay student, faculty and community concerns and will demonstrate that the transformation of "education as we know it" does not mean the end of education as we know it.

Recommendations

- Although the Committee struggled to come up with a definition of distance/distributed education, it did not achieve this goal. The Committee members felt that we were moving toward a clearer definition or categorization of efforts in distance/distributed education. Over the past three years (since the issuance of the Academic Senate "Policy Report on the Use of Electronic Instructional Technology," faculty and staff have engaged in considerable experimentation with and development of computer and electronic based educational technologies. This period of experimentation is necessary and has proven extremely useful. The time has now come to differentiate between more and less successful strategies, their place at Cal Poly, and appropriate methods of implementation. There are substantial resources going to , or being earmarked for, distance/distributed education throughout the state while overall resources for the CSU are declining. In order to make the most responsible use of such resources, programmatic decisions must be made based on a clear understanding of the technologies and pedagogies involved.
- In order to avoid overlapping, redundant, or even contradictory efforts, a "clearing house" should be established to coordinate programs and the allocation of resources. The "clearing house" should be should be an already established administrative entity on campus. The most responsible use of funds requires that programs share knowledge, cooperate and develop a coherent framework for future faculty participation in distance/distributed education. At present, several separate programs coexist with informal linkages. This system is confusing for those seeking help and does not make the most efficient use of resources and knowledge on campus. Technological innovation needs nurturing and a centralized authority for fostering innovation.
- Faculty should be supported through allocation of resources for the development and utilization of new technologies and their efforts need to be supported and encouraged in the retention, tenure and promotion process.
- Any course or courses offered "at a distance" should take into account student support services such as disabled student concerns, library accessibility, student advising and counseling, access to computer facilities, and accessibility to on-line admissions and registration procedures.
- Changes in courses from face-to-face to distributed/distance delivery (from the traditional lab/lecture/seminar/activity mode in which 50% or more of the SCUs occur with the faculty member present to a distributed/distance mode in which 50% or more of the SCUs occur in settings without a faculty member present) should be considered as new courses and should therefore follow the established review process for all new courses
- Assessment of learning is difficult even for courses offered in more traditional forms. The Committee recommends that assessment requirements and standards for distance/distributed courses should be the same as for classes offered in traditional formats.

Re: Final Report of the Task Force on Distance Education

Due to the length of Appendix A, it has not been included with the copy of the Final Report included with this agenda.

9.10.97

Academic Senate Committee Vacancies
For 1997-1998

Academic Senate committees:	**# of vacancies/interested faculty**
Faculty Awards Committee	3 vacancies **(CBUS-Lee Burgunder)** **(CENG-Ron Mullisen)** **(CSM-David Keeling)**
Fairness Board	CENG vacancy **(CENG-H. Mallareddy)**
Grants Review Committee	CSM vacancy PCS vacancy
Instruction Committee	CAED vacancy
Library Committee	CAED vacancy **(CAED-Paul Wack)** CBUS vacancy
Prog Rev & Impr Committee	CAED vacancy CENG vacancy CSM vacancy
Research & Prof Dev Committee	CBUS vacancy
University-wide committees:	
ASI Facilities and Operations Committee	one vacancy 1997-1999 **(Pat Harris, PCS)**
Extended Univ Progs & Servs Committee	one vacancy 1997-1999 **(Barbara Andre, PCS)**
Information Resource Mgmt Policy And Planning Committee	one vacancy 1997-2000
Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee	[replacement for L. Bomstad] one vacancy 1995-1998 **(Norm Borin, CBUS)**
Resource Use Committee	one vacancy 1997-1999
Student Affairs Council	one vacancy 1997-1999

Version: September 10, 1997
(Highlighted/cross-out changes shown on this version were made by Bob Brown and Mike Suess to the previous Executive Committee version of July 16, 1997.)

CAL POLY
PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY

1.0 Performance Salary Step Increases - General Provisions

1.1 Performance Salary Step Increases (PSSIs) recognize outstanding or meritorious performance ~~by Unit 3 employees~~ in each of the following areas: teaching ~~and other professional performance~~, professional growth and achievement, and service to the University, ~~students, and~~ community~~. (CBA Unit 3 – Article 31.18)~~ Faculty unit employees whose performance does not include assignments in all of the above areas shall nonetheless be eligible for a PSSI on the basis of their performance in the individual areas of their assignment. (MOU – see Article 31.14)

1.1.1 The following working definitions shall apply:

Outstanding: exceptional performance; distinguished; acknowledged as a model of performance.

Meritorious: commendable performance; worthy of praise, cooperative and productive work with colleagues.

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. PSSI awards shall consist of from one to five steps on the salary schedule in any single ~~review period. (CBA – Article 31.18)~~ year (MOU – see Article 31.15), or shall be in the form of a bonus (not a permanent increase in the base salary) in those cases where the faculty unit employee has reached the top step of her/his rank and shall not exceed 2.4% of the incumbent's annual salary base.

1.3 For the purposes of PSSI review and funding targets ~~allocation, athletic coaches~~, counselors, librarians, and UCTE Unit 3 employees shall be ~~combined into a single "unit". The Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs shall appoint a review committee consisting of one administrative supervisor from each of the represented areas. (CBA – Article 31.26)~~ considered separate units. Athletic coaches shall be merged with PSSI applicants/nominees of the Physical Education and Kinesiology Department (MOU – see Article 31.23)

1.4 The effective date of all PSSIs awarded shall be ~~in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement~~. July 1st of each year that there are negotiated performance Salary Step Increases. (MOU – see Article 31.25)

1.5 There is no requirement to expend all funds dedicated to the PSSI program in any given fiscal year. Any portion of the funds not expended in any fiscal year shall automatically carry forward to the PSSI pool in the next fiscal year. In the event that the PSSI program is eliminated, any funds that have been carried forward shall be used for the professional development opportunities identified in Provision 25.1 of the ~~Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA, Unit 3, 1995-1998).~~ MOU.

1.6 Each year that the PSSI program is funded, the President shall allot ~~85~~ 80% of the campus funding to the colleges/units based on the number of Full-time Equivalent Unit 3 employees in each ~~College. Deans shall inform all Unit 3 employees within their College as to the total funding available to the College and the specific dollar allocations to each department based on departmental FTEF positions. College Deans shall not retain funding for discretionary use. Funds retained by the President shall be utilized, at the discretion of~~

~~the President, to ensure that Unit 3 employees have the opportunity to receive PSSI awards based on their outstanding performance, rather than the number of Unit 3 employees within their department/unit. The Chair of the Academic Senate shall be notified of the allocation model by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in a timely fashion.~~ college/unit (MOU – see Article 31.29); shall reserve 5% of the campus funding to provide a pool for applicants who are subsequently awarded a PSSI pursuant to an appeal (MOU – see Article 31.39); shall retain 15% of the campus funding to be utilized, at the discretion of the President, to ensure that Unit 3 employees have equal opportunity to receive PSSI awards based on their outstanding performance. The Chair of the Academic Senate shall be notified of the allocation model by the Provost and vice president for Academic Affairs in a timely fashion.

1.7 At each level of evaluation, applicants shall be informed of their standing and be provided with a summary of the ~~rationale for the recommendation~~ basis of their recommendation.

2.0 Eligibility, Applications, and Nominations

2.1 All Unit 3 employees are eligible to submit an application for a PSSI award (see Appendix A - Application Form) or to be nominated by other faculty or academic administrators each year that the PSSI program is funded. ~~(CBA – Article 31.19)~~ (MOU – see Article 31.16)

2.1.1 Applications/nominations ~~for~~ of Department Chairs/Heads, and other equivalent supervisors of Unit 3 employees, who are contractually eligible to apply or be nominated, will be evaluated and recommended by their Dean.

2.1.2 Unit 3 employees who are being evaluated for a PSSI, either through nomination or application, cannot serve on any PSSI related evaluation committee which may evaluate said employee.

2.3 All applications/nominations must be submitted ~~using the approved PSSI Application format (CBA – Article 31.19; see Appendix A). The application is limited to 3 pages, however applicants/nominators may, without disrupting the order of the information presented, alter the space provided for any specific section. To facilitate the application process, Unit 3 employees may download the PSSI application form from *http://www.calpoly.edu/ulib/acadsen* or obtain a electronic file from Faculty Affairs office~~ to the Department chair/Head or equivalent supervisor prior to the application closure date, with a copy to the President or her/his designee, and must follow the approved PSSI Application format (MOU – see Article 31.16; see Appendix A). The application is limited to 3 pages, however, applicants/nominators may, without disrupting the order of the information presented, alter the amount of space indicated for a specific section. To facilitate the application process, Unit 3 employees may download the PSSI application form from the OpenMail Bulletin Area-Forms.

2.4 Evidence emphasized in support of an ~~application or nomination will be the period since the employee's last PSSI award or for the 5 year period prior to the current application/nomination~~ applicant/nominee is to be limited to the period since the employee's last PSSI award; the 5 year period prior to the current PSSI evaluation; o r the interval since their initial appointment at Cal Poly if less than 5 years.

2.5 All applications/nominations and supporting documentation must only be submitted in writing. All forms of electronic, photographic, and other media will be returned to the applicant and will not be considered.

3.0 Departmental Procedures and Criteria

3.1 Procedures and criteria used in evaluating applicants for PSSI awards are to be established by each department/unit and approved by the Dean~~, prior to submission of departmental/unit PSSI recommendations. Criteria used in evaluating applicants/nominees are to be consistent with approved promotion and retention criteria applied in RPT evaluations. (CBA – Article 31.21~~ (Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs (Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs for UCTE, Counselors, and Librarians). Criteria to be used in evaluating applicants/nominees are to be consistent with approved guidelines applied in RPT evaluations. (MOU – see Article 31.18).

3.2 Departments may elect to utilize a College level review board. In such cases, the department/unit would request that the Dean convene an elected ~~College level review committee. The composition of said review committee should be consistent with current RPT regulations, but could include representation from departments/units outside of the College when requested by the department/unit being evaluated~~ Review Board. The composition of the Review Board should be similar to the College Peer Review Committee used in promotion considerations, but could include representation from departments/units outside of the College when requested b the department/unit being evaluated.

The Counselor, Librarian, and UTE units may elect to request that the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs appoint a Review Board consisting of tenured faculty.

3.3 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 (CBA – Article 31.17).~~ area of teaching, as well as other professional accomplishments and service to the University community. (MOU – see Article 31.14)

3.4 Academic departments/units ~~(unless replaced by college level review board)~~ shall constitute the "highest level faculty review committee" with regard to PSSI applications/nominations ~~and shall submit their recommendations to both the Dean of the College and the President of the University (CBA – Article 31.31). Departmental recommendations shall not exceed the anticipated funding level for the department~~ unless replaced by a Review Board. Following completion of the highest level faculty review committee, all applications/nominations shall be forwarded to the Dean of the College. Departmental PSSI recommendations, including the number of salary steps recommended, shall be forwarded to both the Dean of the College and the President of the University (MOU – see Article 31.21) the total cost of all departmental recommendations shall not exceed the targeted allocation for the department/unit.

3.4.1 Applicants/nominees shall be informed by their department/unit PSSI committee/Review Board of its ~~as to their~~ recommendation and number of steps for which they were recommended~~, along with a summary of their evaluation. Applicants may forward a one page rebuttal statement to the Dean to be included with their original PSSI application~~.

3.4.2 ~~Applicants who, based on departmental ranking, receive positive recommendations, but for whom there is insufficient funding shall have their recommendation forwarded on a separate list for consideration by the Dean~~ Applicants/nominees who receive positive recommendations, but for whom there is insufficient funding within the targeted departmental/unit allocation shall have their recommendation forwarded on a separate list for consideration by the Dean.

~~**3.4.3** Applicants/nominees may forward a one page rebuttal, to the deparmental or Review Board recommendation, to the Dean within 7 calendar days of their notification. Statements submitted by applicants/nominees shall be included with their original PSSI application.~~

4.0 ~~**Dean's**~~ **Administrative Review**

4.1 The Dean or appropriate administrator of each College/unit shall receive all PSSI applications and recommendations from each department/unit within the College. After review of the applications/nominations, departmental recommendations, ~~applications/nominations~~, and consultation with the Department Chairs/Heads ~~each Dean will submit their PSSI recommendations to the President. The total cost of all steps recommended by the Dean shall not exceed the anticipated dollar allocation to the College~~ the Dean or appropriate administrator will submit her/his PSSI recommendations to the President. The total cost of all steps recommended by the Dean shall not exceed the target allocation for the College/unit.

4.2 Administrative review of counselors shall be the responsibility of the Vice President of Student Affairs or her/his designee; for librarians the Dean of Library Services or her/his designee; andfor UCTE the Director of UCTE or her/his designee.

4.3 Applicants/nominees shall be informed by their Dean, or appropriate administrator, as to her/his recommendation and number of steps for which they were recommended.

4.3.1 Applicants/nominees who receive positive recommendations, but for whom there is insufficient funding within the targeted allocation for the College (or equivalent unit) shall have their recommendation forwarded on a separate list for consideration by the President.

4.3.2 Applicants/nominees may forward a one page response, regarding the recommendation of the Dean, or appropriate administrator, to the President within 7 calendar days of their notification. Statements submitted by applicants/nominees shall be included with their original PSSI application.

~~**4.1.1** Applicants/nominees shall be informed of the Dean's recommendation and the number of steps for which the applicant/nominee was recommended. Furthermore, applicants/nominees shall receive a summary of the Dean's evaluation of their application/nomination. Applicants may forward a one page rebuttal statement to the President to be included with their original PSSI application.~~

~~**4.1.2** Applicants/nominees who are recommended by the Dean, but for whom there is insufficient funding shall have their recommendation forwarded to the President on a separate list for consideration by the President.~~

5.0 President's Review

5.1 The President or designee shall review the applications/nominations, recommendations from the academic departments/units and College Dean, or appropriate administrator, which have been submitted for consideration. The President shall notify all applicants, within 30 academic working days, of the decision to grant or deny a PSSI award for outstanding or meritorious performance~~, along with a summary of their evaluation~~. Applicants ~~granted~~ awarded a PSSI shall also be informed of the number of steps to be granted and the effective date of the award.

5.2 Applicants who are recommended by their ~~Dean~~ highest level faculty review committee and denied a PSSI award by the President shall have the right to request a review of their application by the Peer Review Panel (see Section ~~7.0~~ 7.1 below).

6.0 PSSI calendar and timeline

6.1 The specific timeline covering notification, application, evaluation, ~~and Presidential awards~~ and PSSI award announcements shall be established by the ~~Academic Senate each year that the PSSI program *is* funded by the CSU system~~ by the President in consultation with the Academic Senate.

~~**6.1.1** Notification of all Unit 3 employees should occur within 30 days of the campus receiving notification of the funding approval.~~

~~**6.1.2** Application/nomination closure date shall be the end of the 4th week of the quarter in which the departmental review will take place.~~

~~**6.1.3** Department evaluations shall conclude and all recommendations shall be forwarded to the applicants, Dean, and President by the end of the 8th week of the quarter in which the departmental evaluation takes place. While the notification of the applicants must contain their specific recommendation, including number of steps for which they were recommended, each department/unit shall determine the extent of the information contained within the notification to the applicant (see section 3.1 above)~~

~~**6.1.4** The recommendations of the Dean shall be submitted to the President within 15 academic working days of the notification of the departmental recommendations.~~

~~6.1.5 The President shall notify all applicants, within 30 academic working days of receiving the college/unit recommendations, of the decision to grant or deny a PSSI award for outstanding or meritorious performance.~~

7.0 Peer Review of PSSI denials

7.1 Applicants/nominees who have received a favorable recommendation ~~from their department or college/unit PSSI committee~~ from their highest level faculty review committee and who subsequently fail to receive a PSSI award shall be eligible to have their application reviewed by the University Peer Review Panel. The appeal letter~~, addressed to the Provost, will be a maximum of six pages~~ may be up to six pages in length double-spaced, and must be received by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs within ten academic working days of ~~the notification of denial~~ receipt of the notification of denial. (MOU – see Article 31.40)

7.2 University Peer Review Panels, consisting of 3 members and 1 alternate, will be appointed by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with ~~the Chair of the Academic Senate~~ California Faculty Association Members shall be selected by lot from among all full-time tenured faculty who did not serve on a PSSI committee, and who were not applicants/nominees for a PSSI award. (MOU – see Articles 31.41; 31.42)

7.3 The University Peer Panel shall begin to review the specific Performance Salary Step denial within 14 days of its selection ~~by lot~~. The Panel's review shall be limited to a reconsideration of the increase denial of the applicant/nominee, and the employer's written response to any allegations made by the affected employee Except for presentations of the complainant and the administrator, if the administrator chooses, the peer review will be made from the documents set forth in Section ~~32.39~~ 31.43 of the MOU.

The proceeding above will not be open to the public and shall not be a hearing, per MOU 31.40.

~~No later than thirty (30) days after its selection, the University Peer Panel shall submit to the President and the complainant a written report of its findings and recommendations. All written materials considered by the University Peer Panel shall be forwarded to the President. When the Panel has complied with Section 31.41 of the MOU, it shall be discharged of its duties for any individual case.~~

7.4 ~~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 her/his 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.~~

7.4 The University Peer Review Panel proceeding will not be open to the public and shall not constitute a hearing. (MOU – see Article 31.44)

7.5 No later than thirty (30) days after its selection, the University peer Review Panel shall submit to the President and complainant a writen report of its findings and recommendations. All written materials considered by the University Peer Review Panel shall be forwarded to the President. When the panel has complied with this section, it shall be discharged of its duties for any individual case. (MOU – see Article 31.45)

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

Proposed 1997-98 PSSI Schedule

September 15 to October 31 (7 weeks)

- Departments develop criteria and procedures to be used in evaluating PSSI applicants.
- Departmental PSSI criteria to be submitted to the Dean for approval by Oct 31, 1997

Oct 31 - November 21 (3 weeks)

- Dean's review and approval of department PSSI criteria.

Nov 21 - January 9 (6 weeks)

- PSSI applications due to the Department Chair/Head

Jan 9 - February 6 (4 weeks)

- Department review of applicants.
- Department recommendations submitted to the President, Dean, and applicants by Feb. 6th.

Feb 6 – Feb 27 (3 weeks)

- Review of PSSI materials by the Dean
- Dean's recommendations submitted to the President and applicants by Feb 27.

Feb 27- April 3 (5 weeks)

- Review of PSSI materials and recommendations by the President or his designee
- President notifies applicants of his decision by April 3rd.

April 3 - April 17 (2 weeks)

- Peer Review requests due to the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs by April 17th.

April 24 (1 week)

- Review Panel formed.

April 24 - June 5 (6 weeks)

- Review Panel report submitted to the President by June 5th.

June 19 (2 weeks)

- Applicants notified of the President's decision.

SAMPLE PSSI APPLICATION

Name of Applicant: _____

Department: _____

Date of Last PSSI Award
and Number of Steps: _____

TEACHING PERFORMANCE: (limited to one page)

Applicants are encouraged to include discussion of their teaching philosophy and methods, contributions to curricular development, and efforts to implement innovative instruction.

(actual space used, up to the one page limit, to be determined by the applicant)

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: (limited to one page)

Please list your 3 most important accomplishments in the area of professional development. Applicants should include discussion of how their professional activities relate to their teaching function and the mission of the university.

(actual space used, up to the one page limit, to be determined by the applicant)

SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY: (limited to one page)

Please list your 3 most important accomplishments in the area of service to the university community. Applicants should address how their service enhances and promotes the mission of the university.

(actual space used, up to the one page limit, to be determined by the applicant)

Adopted:

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

AS-___-97/
RESOLUTION ON
THE 1997-1998 BUDGET

WHEREAS, The *Draft Budget Planning Concept Statement for the 1997-1999 Time Frame of Cal Poly* emphasizes the education of its students and the pursuit of academic endeavors; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly maintains its national and statewide reputation by virtue of its academic achievement and the success of its graduates; and

WHEREAS, The amount of funds available for the 1997-1998 year will require that the budget allocations be very judiciously scrutinized in order to meet the academic demands of the enrolled students of Cal Poly; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That support for academic programs should be given the highest priority in the upcoming budget considerations.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Budget and
Long-Range Planning Committee
Date: September 23, 1997

Adopted:

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

AS-___-97/
RESOLUTION ON
FACULTY GOVERNANCE OF MODE OF INSTRUCTION

WHEREAS, Curriculum development and oversight are among the most important responsibilities of the faculty; and

WHEREAS, The curriculum process is best served when a climate of full disclosure and consultation is encouraged; and

WHEREAS, The use of distributed and distance learning techniques is becoming much more frequent; and

WHEREAS, The use of distributed and distance learning techniques represents a significant and relatively experimental change in instructional mode; and

WHEREAS, There is currently no mechanism of university-wide faculty review for the use of distributed and distance learning; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That new course proposals should specify whether or not distance and distributed learning techniques will be used, to what degree they will be used, and a rationale for how these techniques will contribute to positive student outcomes; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That existing courses undergoing a change in mode of instruction from traditional to distributed or distance learning be reviewed under current policies and procedures for new courses; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Instruction and Curriculum Committees provide an annual report to the full Senate regarding the use of distributed and distance learning on campus.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Date: September 23, 1997

Adopted:

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

AS-___-97/
RESOLUTION ON
SEARCH PROCESS AND QUALIFICATIONS
FOR NEW CSU CHANCELLOR

WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees has determined that the current CSU Chancellor Search Committee will not include a faculty member except the Faculty Trustee; and

WHEREAS, The elimination of faculty representative on the search committee is contrary to prior practice and breaches the CSU Statement of Collegiality which acknowledges and respects the faculty's role in the shared governance of the University; and

WHEREAS, The Chancellor of the CSU is the academic leader of this institution, and faculty are significantly affected by this leadership; and

WHEREAS, Faculty have the professional responsibility to execute the CSU's primary mission of education and should therefore participate directly in the search for its academic leader; and

WHEREAS, Direct faculty participation in the search process will enhance the credibility of the new Chancellor selection both within and outside the CSU system; and

WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees has recognized the importance of its search for a new Chancellor and has requested written input on the qualifications for the position; and

WHEREAS, The chief academic and chief executive officer of the CSU system should demonstrate experience in the academy through teaching and scholarship as well as administrative experience in complex organizations; and

WHEREAS, The position description for the new Chancellor no longer emphasizes these academic qualifications but refers only to the candidate's "commitment to higher education and the values of an academic community" and "demonstrated commitment to quality education"; and

WHEREAS, This recent change in the job description for the next Chancellor has given the impression that this leader need not be well acquainted with the culture of higher education;

WHEREAS, These developments may have the unfortunate effect of undermining the cooperation and trust between faculty and CSU administration and could also undermine the confidence of the faculty in its next academic leader; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly State University urge the CSU Board of Trustees to permit CSU faculty to participate directly and meaningfully in the Chancellor search process through faculty representation on the search committee; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly State University urge in the strongest possible terms that the CSU Board of Trustees revise its job description for CSU Chancellor to include the requirement that the candidate have a record in teaching, scholarship, and academic administration; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That pursuant to the CSU Board of Trustees request for written input from faculty on the qualifications for the next Chancellor, that copies of this resolution be distributed to each member of the Board and to the Academic Senate CSU.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: September 23, 1997

Faculty Professional Conduct from Faculty Affairs Committee

Whereas faculty have harassed colleagues

Whereas faculty have not shown due respect for the opinion of others, especially other faculty

Whereas faculty have not been objective in their professional judgment of colleagues

Whereas there exists a Code of Ethics for faculty at Cal Poly

Whereas correction is felt to be more effective than punishment, be it

Resolved, That Employee Association Program (EAP) services be more effectively publicized to the campus community and that Administration take the lead in this matter

Resolved, That Mandatory sensitivity training for faculty/administrators be given in the content area of interpersonal conflict

Resolved, That a formal training program for department heads/chairs and college deans concerning awareness skills of interpersonal problems, conflict/dispute resolution skills and mediation skills take place

Resolved, That individual disputes/conflicts be encouraged to be voluntarily mediated with assistance from EAP staff where possible

Resolved, That a standing Committee on Professional Ethics be established by the Academic Senate in accord with the attached guidelines

Guidelines for the Committee on Professional Ethics

1. The Committee of Professional Ethics shall consist of seven full-time tenured faculty members, one from each college and the University Center for Teacher Education

2. The seven members will be elected by their respective constituencies and shall serve overlapping two-year terms. This shall be accomplished initially be having three members elected to one year terms and four elected to two year terms with the elections in following years to be for two-year terms

3. The Committee shall meet initially in the fall quarter to elect a chair. Meetings will be scheduled as needed based on case-load situations.

4. The Committee may function as an advisory group to a faculty member with a perceived peer conduct problem.

5. The Committee is empowered to investigate allegations of unethical conduct covered by the Faculty Code of Ethics except those covered by other legal means (e.g. MOU complaints and grievances, Sexual Harassment Policy, etc.)

6. Specific, advisory recommendations will be made by the Committee to rectify problem situations where possible with the approval of both the faculty member and the appropriate administrator

7. Professional censure power to cease and desist specific behavior(s)will be granted to the Committee by the Academic Senate.

Evaluation of Academic Deans from Faculty Affairs Committee

Whereas Academic Deans are currently evaluated using the Performance Evaluation Form

Whereas Academic Deans have responsibilities toward faculty in their respective administrative units

Whereas Academic Deans may perceive that efforts toward personnel (faculty/staff) may not be valued as highly without specific performance objectives targeted in this area

Whereas faculty members may be unaware of efforts made by their academic Dean because of a lack of specificity of performance objectives

Whereas a specific portion of a Dean's efforts have not been percieved to be historically directed toward faculty

Whereas specific performance objectives directed toward faculty can only increase collegial actions

Whereas there are common topical areas (e.g. communication, work environment, professional growth, etc.) that lend themselves to consistent evaluation by the Provost and Academic Vice President for Academic Deans

Whereas there is an opportunity to improve the performance of Academic Deans by increased interaction and cooperation of the faculty

Be It Resolved that the Function of Personnel (specifically faculty) be recognized in the evaluation of Academic Deans by the Provost and Academic Vice President using the existing Performance Evaluation Form

Be It Resolved that specific performance objective(s) be developed for Academic Deans in concert with the Academic Senate by the Provost and Academic Vice President in appropriate topical areas for faculty (e.g. communication, working environment, professional development, etc.)

Be it Resolved that the Provost and Academic Vice President continue to dialogue with the Academic Senate to improve Academic Dean performance through the use of such tools as Academic Dean Evaluation Forms , performance objectives, or any additonal appropriate efforts.

Faculty Input for Writing Job Description for Academic Administrators from Faculty Affairs Committee

Whereas there is an effort to improve collegiality at the university

Whereas faculty members are currently a part of search committees for academic administrators

Whereas potential confusion or uncertainty may exist if the search committee does not draft the job description

Whereas signficant concern by the search committee if the job description is drafted by another group or person is not the proper atmosphere to begin a search for candidates

Whereas being a part of the process from the very beginnning increases the "ownership" of any decisions made

Whereas there would be consultation with the appointing administrative officer

Be It Resolved that the Job Description for Administrative Positions with Academic Responsibilities to the Provost and Academic Vice President be written by the designated search committee with appropriate faculty representation.

Minutes - Exec Com
9-23-97

September 23, 1997

CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

Resolution on Faculty Professional Conduct

1. The scope of matters that would come before a Professional Ethics Committee is greater than harassment. This resolution narrows the charge of the committee to "an advisory group to a faculty member with a *perceived peer conduct problem.*" The resolution itself is harassing.

2. The language of the resolution is extremely offensive.

3. There are two matters addressed by the resolution (a) sensitivity training, and (b) establishment of a Faculty Ethics Committee. These should be separated into two resolutions.

4. Examples of the type of matters that would be heard by a Professional Ethics Committee should be given in the resolution.

5. Within the Guidelines, the committee is defined as an "*advisory*" group to the "*faculty member with a perceived peer conduct problem.*" Advising a faculty member on behavioral issues seems an inappropriate gesture for a peer committee.

6. Should a peer committee be granted the "*the professional censure power to cease and desist specific behavior(s)*"?

Resolution on Evaluation of Academic Deans

1. The issue of dean evaluation has been in the Faculty Affairs Committee since 1990. Over this period, the committee has been asked to look at several issues involving the most effective instrument for evaluating a dean's performance and relationship to her/his college faculty. These issues have not been addressed in the resolution submitted. Some of these considerations are:
   a. Should one instrument be used for deans and other senior administrators?
   b. Would an elected representative body of faculty be more effective in evaluating deans than a written evaluation form?
   c. How often should a dean be evaluated?
   d. What is the provision for reporting results back to the faculty?
   e. What weight should faculty evaluations have in a dean's overall review?
   f. Do survey-type evaluation forms provide meaningful information to the Provost in her/his review of a dean?
   g. Are evaluations returned from enough faculty members to be considered representative?
   h.
2. The Resolved clauses are merely stating what the charge to the Faculty Affairs Committee has been for the past seven years.

Resolution on Faculty Input for Writing Job Descriptions for Academic Administrators

Advertisement for an academic administrator position must often be submitted before a search committee can be convened. The resolution would add flexibility if it recognized that when a position must be advertised before the formation of a search committee, that the job description be submitted to the Academic Senate Executive Committee for its comments.

Minutes Exec Com 9/22/97

Additional changes to the PSSI document:

Section 3.1....deleted "(Provost and VPAA for UCTE. Conselors, and Librarians)" and replaed it with "appropriate administrator" because you have identifeid appropriate administrator in Section 4.2 and this maintains consistency.

Section 3.4: removed quotation marks " " around highest level faculty review committee since the quotes are no longer needed for reference.

Sections 5.2 deleted: "recommended by their highest level faculty review committee"

Section 7.2 deleted: "have received a favorable recommendaiton from their higher level faculty reviwe committee who subsequently fail"

Section 7.3, changed "Employer" to "appropriate administrator"....(Bob this can be anyone the President decides and has been the Provost...employer seemed so harsh)

On Page 5, under Oct 31 date changed to "Dean/appropriate adminisistrator...

Page 5, under Feb 6, changed to : Dean/appropriate administrator recommendations....

Page 5, under Feb 27, change "his" to "PSSI" (to remove masculine gender pronoun)....

Page 6, under Jan 15, moved spacing of Academic Affairs