

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

Academic Senate Executive Committee Agenda
April 26, 1994
UU 220 3:00-5:00 p.m.

- I. Minutes: Approval of the March 29, April 5, and April 19, 1994 Executive Committee minutes (p. 2-6).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
Please mark your calendars: The President's luncheon for the Academic Senate Executive Committee is scheduled for May 25, 1994.
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair
 - B. President's Office
 - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
 - D. Statewide Senators
 - E. CFA Campus President
 - F. ASI representatives
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. Election of members to the Program Review and Improvement Committee for the 1994-1996 term for CAGR, CBUS, and CLA. **[ATTN CAUCUS CHAIRS FOR CAGR, CBUS, AND CLA: PLEASE BRING THE NAMES OF THE NOMINEES FROM YOUR COLLEGE TO THIS MEETING.]**
 - B. Selection of nominees to the Educational Equity Commission. **[PLEASE BRING THE NAMES OF YOUR NOMINEES TO THIS MEETING.]**
 - C. Establishing an ad hoc committee to investigate the use of technology in delivering academic programs/curriculum (pp. 7-8).
 - D. Resolution on Academic Program Review and Improvement Guideline Change-Heidersbach, Chair of the PRAIC (pp. 9-14).
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
 - A. Formation of a Research Advisory Committee.
 - B. President Baker's response to AS-419-94/PPC "Resolution on Evaluation of College Deans or Equivalent Administrators" (p. 15).
 - C. Selection of faculty to the charter governance committee and the charter employee relations committee.
 - D. How can faculty make meaningful recommendations regarding budget allocations to administration?
 - E. Formation of a committee to review/revise the existing program discontinuance procedures.
 - F. "Consultation'...within a Collective Bargaining Context"-Russell (p. 16).
 - G. Academic Senate agenda matters for the remainder of 1993-1994.
- VII. Adjournment:

FILE COPY

To: Executive Committee

From: Jack Wilson, Chair

Subject: The Virtual University

As we are all aware there is much faculty concern about the place of multimedia and distance learning in higher education. The recent article about The Virtual University in the TT brought to mind some of those concerns. Decisions concerning multimedia and distance learning have and are being made by the administration with little or no faculty input. In the case of the new IBM 9000 mainframe computer the decision by the administration to purchase was made despite faculty opposition. A main reason for purchasing it was to support multimedia. A person has been hired, her salary split between the state and IBM, to support faculty development of multimedia. I could go on and on but it is not productive to rehash past decisions except as they impact academic programs and more specifically curriculum. Curriculum is the province of the faculty and no one else.

Therefore it is time, and in fact past the time, for the faculty to begin the process that sets in place the accommodation of multimedia and distance learning into education here. If we are not careful multimedia and distance learning will drive curriculum and not the other way around. Multimedia and distance learning have their places in higher education, let's get out front and determine what those places are. Then we can set the policy that will insure that multimedia and distance learning don't become the cart that drives the horse called curriculum.

We understand that multimedia and distance learning are different technologies with different applications. I think of multimedia as being primarily a way to supplement the traditional lecture. Therefore it will impact campus instruction. I understand distance learning as a way to reach students off campus who are not able, for a variety of reasons, to attend classes on campus.

We all recognize that it is important to begin to grapple with the program and curricular issues inherent in multimedia and distance learning. This will involve budgets since there is a substantial initial cost of putting into place the technology component of multimedia and distance learning. There is of course the larger question of how these technologies alter learning. That is something we will probably never address, unfortunately, given the propensity in this nation to buy into technology without considering the downside.

At any rate I propose we establish an ad hoc committee composed primarily of faculty which would address the following. First, are these technologies already driving academic programs and curriculum and how? If the answer is affirmative, what does

the committee recommend as steps to insure the integrity of programs and curriculum. Or to put it another way, what steps are necessary to insure that faculty retain control of programs and curriculum?

From the resource angle we would want to get a handle on the resources now being directed to multimedia and distance learning. What have the expenditures involved with those resources bought us?

Where do we want to go with these technologies? What is the place of multimedia in instruction on this campus? What is the place of distance learning for this campus? What if we decide that the campus is at point A and would like to move to point B, what would the cost be? What would be best way to get there? What is the need, and then what is the plan to get there without breaking the bank?

A larger more fundamental question that we might want this committee to look into is the impact of multimedia on instruction and learning.

There is already a committee, composed primarily of faculty that has been appointed by Carol Barnes, Dean of Extended Ed., to look into distance learning. Dennis Nulman is our representative on that committee.

There are as usual a number of ways we can build this committee. My first notion was that we have someone from the budget and instruction committees and someone from the Instructional Advisory Committee on Computing. Then we could select a few other faculty. We would want a student and perhaps a staff person on it also. I believe it is important that we have faculty on this committee who have some knowledge about and practical experience with multimedia, and perhaps distance learning, and yet are open minded about these technologies and their impact on instruction and learning. That is that they realize there are pros and cons. In other words no technophiles wanted. I can think of people who I believe fit the bill.

I visualize this committee receiving a multiple-step charge. There are some things we would like from it so the full senate can act on it this academic year, and there are perhaps other things that could wait until the next academic year.

Give me your input ASAP (can you do it this week?). I'll put together all of our thoughts and based on that try to present a proposed committee makeup and charge for our consideration at our Feb. 1st meeting. Meantime be thinking of people you would recommend for this committee. I would like to get it formed and going by the beginning of the 6th week of this quarter.

Adopted:

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

AS- -94/PRAIC
RESOLUTION ON
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT
GUIDELINE CHANGE

- WHEREAS, The guidelines for the Program Review and Improvement Committee set forth broad criteria for reviewing programs; and
- WHEREAS, Some of the material in the existing guidelines does not provide enough information to justify the effort required to gather and submit it; and
- WHEREAS, Asking programs to submit all the material in the guidelines makes the compilation of documents, and their review, burdensome; and
- WHEREAS The existing guidelines are on some subjects vague and ambiguous requiring flexibility on the part of the committee; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the Program Review and Improvement Committee have the flexibility to decide what information within the existing guidelines will best serve the interests of the university community; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Program Review and Improvement Committee recommend changes in procedure, if any, as a standard component of their annual report.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Program Review and Improvement
Committee
April 19, 1994

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT GUIDELINES

[*Indicates data to be provided by the Institutional Studies Office]

I. MISSION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

- A. Relevance of the program to the special mission of Cal Poly and/or the mission of the CSU:
See Attachment A - Title 5 description of Subchapter 2 "Educational Program", Articles 1 and 2; Attachment B - Mission Statement of the California State University; and Attachment C - Cal Poly's Mission Statement.
- B. Evidence that the program mission, goals, and objectives are being met:
List the program mission, goals, and objectives. Include your departmental priorities. See Attachment D - list of examples of instructional priorities for reference.
- C. Contribution to the community, state, and nation:
In what general ways does the program contribute to each of these? Are the graduates of particular service?

II. PROGRAM QUALITY

- A. Curriculum:
 - *1. Appropriate sequence, patterns of delivery, and size of class:
Using data provided by Institutional Studies, identify low/over-enrollment courses and explain circumstances for each. Low enrollment courses, as defined by Administrative Bulletin 82-1, are courses with less than 13 students for lower division, less than 10 students for upper division, less than 5 students for graduate courses, and frequency of offering of these courses for the last two years. Identify graduate courses with high undergraduate enrollment and explain circumstances for each one. Describe structure of curriculum including actual or possible course taking sequences and patterns (demonstrate with flow chart).

What other programs on campus have an impact on the ability of your students to graduate on time?
 - 2. Appropriate comparison with similar peer programs:
Summarize and compare with identical or similar programs.
 - 3. Appropriate course mix related to previously stated goals and objectives:
Do your course offerings meet the stated goals and objectives of your department?

List all major concentrations currently offered and specify the number of students enrolled in each.
 - 4. Quality evaluation method:
Provide information on how your program is evaluated by the appropriate means including one or more of the following methods:
 - a. accreditation:
Indicate if accreditation agencies exist for your program evaluation. Is your program accredited? Provide summary report from last accreditation review.
 - b. outside evaluation:
Indicate any other foundations, professional associations or societies, or external peer reviews that are used to evaluate your

program.

c. **other:**

If used, indicate occurrences and formal procedures for student and alumni evaluation.

5. **Currency:**

Describe how your curriculum has responded to factors such as changing emphasis in the discipline, new technological development, changing character of society, current national curricular trends, demands by the profession and employers, etc.

6. **Professional support:**

What support (nonmonetary) is provided by your profession in contributing to the enhancement of your curriculum.

7. **Professional service:**

List the service or in-service activities sponsored by your program during the past five years and list the number of people accommodated in each activity. Were these activities offered for credit?

8. **Evidence of interdisciplinary activity:**

List any interdisciplinary/problem-based studies or activities emphasizing the unity of knowledge and the cooperative contributions of individual disciplines.

Briefly describe any courses developed by two or more departments for a major in your program or any cooperative arrangements that have been explored.

Briefly describe the interrelationship of your program with other programs.

9. **Evidence of use of senior project as a learning tool:**

Is senior project an essential component of your curriculum? What role does it play as a part of your major? How is senior project organized and managed in your department? How many students do not successfully complete senior project in your majors?

10. **Contribution to GE&B program at Cal Poly:**

If your program provides GE&B courses, please identify those courses.

11. **Student advising:**

Summarize the academic, professional, and career advising service that your program offers and its effectiveness.

Are advising responsibilities shared by all faculty? Briefly describe the department's procedures to ensure that students receive accurate and timely academic advising.

B. **Faculty:**

Many of the faculty professional activities can be summarized in a table format. See Attachment E for example of a form to use.

*1. **Demographics:**

a. affirmative action target goals

*b. gender

*c. ethnic diversity

2. **Specific qualifications appropriate to discipline**

3. Diversity of faculty:
 - a. professional background
 - b. areas of expertise
 - c. appropriate faculty expertise related to professional background
4. Professionalism and professional work experience
5. Evidence of teaching excellence for past five years
6. Evidence of mentoring and personal development of faculty for past five years
7. Service to the university, college, and community for past five years
- *8. Percent of tenure-track versus nontenure-track faculty

C. Students:

1. Student profile:
 - *a. average SAT scores of enrolled FTE students
 - *b. average GPA of new transfer students
 - *c. gender and ethnicity
 - d. honors, awards, scholarships:

Are the trends of items a - d over the last five years of any significance to the program?
 - e. number of students transferring into and out of major:

What percent of your students leave your program as internal transfers per year? What percent of your students are internal transfers? Identify any major difficulties students transferring in may have in completing the program.
 - f. average quarterly class load enrolled in by major students:

What percent of your students are primarily full-time students? Are significant numbers of students part-time because of program or institutional policy?
 - g. Evidence of student involvement in program (i.e., clubs, extra projects, etc.)
2. Evidence of successful program completion:
 - *a. student graduation rates:

Do the trends over the last five years of the percentages of majors graduating indicate any significant changes in the program? Over the last five years, indicate the number of majors who have filed for graduation and the number who have completed their degree.
 - *b. student persistence rates:

How many students who enter eventually complete the program?
 - *c. average length of time for students to graduate:

Why are students not completing their degrees according to projected time frames?
 - d. percent of graduate placement (over the last five years):
 - (1) graduate programs at other universities:

What percentage of your graduates attend graduate programs at other schools?
 - (2) graduate programs at Cal Poly:

What percentage of your graduates attend graduate programs at Cal Poly?
 - (3) jobs requiring your or a similar college degree:

What percent of your graduates are currently employed in

- a field utilizing your or a similar college degree?
 - (4) jobs requiring any other college degree:
What percent of your graduates are currently employed in a field utilizing any other college degree?
 - (5) unknown:
Of your graduates, what percent is of unknown status?
 - e. other evidence of success relevant to field:
What are the pass rates for professional registration or certification, acceptance rates to graduates internships, etc.?
 - 3. **Alumni evaluations (5-, 10-, 15-year post-graduation evaluations):**
 - a. **strengths of program:**
What input have you received from alumni regarding the strengths of your program?
 - b. **weaknesses of program:**
What input have you received from alumni regarding the weaknesses of your program?
 - c. **adequacy of knowledge acquired for entry level jobs:**
Do the students have an adequate level of knowledge acquired for entry-level jobs?
 - d. **adequacy of program to provide for the overall university experience:**
How does your program keep in contact with alumni? How do the responses from the different post-graduation ages differ?
- D. **Academic Support Services**
 - 1. **Adequacy of facilities/services:**
How adequate are your facilities such as classrooms, offices, laboratories, etc.?
 - 2. **Adequacy of equipment inventories:**
How adequate is your equipment inventory including computers, lab equipment, and maintenance of this equipment?
 - 3. **Adequacy of access to library resources:**
How adequate is your access to the resources available to the library:
 - a. **quality and quantity of library collection:**
Is the library's collection sufficient in quality, depth, diversity, and currentness to meet the needs of the academic program?
 - b. **Relationship to program:**
Is the library's collection structured in direct relationship to the nature and level of the academic program's curricular offerings, including graduate courses?

III. PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY

*A. Efficient use of state resources:

- 1. Faculty positions used and faculty positions generated by your program for each of the last five years.
- 2. Staff positions used and staff positions generated by your program for each of the last five years.
- 3. Administrative time used and administrative time generated by your program for each of the last five years.
- 4. Average total cost (salary, O&E, equipment, travel, telephone, etc.) per annual SCU taught for your program for each of the last five years.
- 5. Average total cost per FTE major student for your program for each of the last five years.
- 6. Average annual WTU taught per FTEF for your program for each of the last five years (for each faculty member).
- 7. Average quarterly faculty contact-hour load for your program (for each

faculty member).

B. Generation and use of non-state resources:

(It should be acknowledged that there is not equality of opportunity for all programs in this regard.)

1. Provide a list of all grants and contracts submitted and funded by your faculty for each of the last five years (give title and dollar amount).
2. For each of the last five years, list the amount of money generated via your programs fundraising efforts. Also indicate how this money was spent.
3. For each of the last five years, list the gifts of equipment, supplies, and services received by your program.
4. List all other non-state income generated for each of the last five years and indicate how that money was spent.

IV. PROGRAM NEED

A. Job market need:

Are graduates from the program in demand? If applicable, what is the ratio of requests for graduates at the Placement Center to actual graduates?

***B. Program uniqueness:**

1. What is the need for the program at Cal Poly, in the State of California, nationwide? Compare enrollment to other programs in the state.
2. Are there courses offered in your department that are similar to courses offered in other departments? If so, what is the specific need for these courses within your department?

C. Integral component to state university education:

Is your program essential to CSU education?

***D. Student demand:**

Provide data on the number of applicants to your program and the number of students accommodated. Include any other relevant information on these students if appropriate.

V. SELF-ASSESSMENT

Identify the strengths, weaknesses and any constraints existing for your program. Draw from the information compiled in the preceding sections of this document. Indicate strategies or plans designed to improve the areas of weakness and future areas of strengthening for your program.

-15-
RECEIVED

State of California

APR 20 1994

CAL POLY

San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

MEMORANDUM


Academic Senate

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
Academic Senate

Date: March 29, 1994

File No.:

Copies: Robert Koob
Michael Suess

From: 
Warren J. Baker
President

Subject: **RESPONSE TO AS-419-94/PPC**

I remain unconvinced that this type of evaluation form used without evidence that it fairly represents college opinion is of utility in the evaluation of senior administrators. A far more effective contribution would be the considered opinion of an elected representative committee of faculty comparable to those that serve on college RPT committees. Nonetheless, if this is the input faculty desire in the evaluation of deans or their equivalent administrators, we will continue to implement those wishes.



Office of the Academic Senate • One Washington Square • San Jose, California 95192-0024 • 408/924-2440 • ATSS 8/556-2440

At its meeting of September 27, 1993, the Academic Senate approved the following Report presented by Cecilia Mullen for the Organization and Government Committee.

**"CONSULTATION" UNDER IV.D OF THE STATEMENT ON
ACADEMIC SENATES WITH A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTEXT**

IV.D of the statement covers two matters: the academic calendar and selection and review of administrators. In these two areas, Presidents have said that they are entitled to prepare the initial draft of a policy proposal and are entitled to determine its final form and content. The Academic Senate is to be "consulted", but it is not, unless requested, to revise the President's draft and present its revision to him/her for approval or rejection.

It is suggested that the following procedure be followed for consultation on IV.D policies:

1. The President's draft should be laid before the Executive Committee. If the Executive Committee agrees that the proposed policy comes under IV.D, it should refer the draft to the appropriate policy committee for consideration as stated below.
2. The policy committee should review the draft and prepare a report for the Senate stating its conclusions and recommendations. It should not revise the President's draft but, in its report, may propose changes.
3. The draft and the policy committee's report should be considered by the Senate. The Senate should not make changes in the text of the draft, but should act on the policy committee's report, which it may amend or revise. The report, as approved by the Senate, shall be sent to the President for his/her consideration before issuance of the policy.

Spec - Mon 4.26.94

Meeting of the Campus Senate Chairs
April 7, 1994 Long Beach

California Assembly.

AB28-95. Archie-Hudson deals with accountability & assessment of success at universities.

Woodruff proposes a constitutional amendment giving guaranteed % of California budget to universities. No stand taken.

CSU Senate doing self-study

Much discussion of Pat Callan's committee and proposals.

Assembly is taking this seriously. We can't afford to ignore it. Consensus that we need to protect our 4-year plan, not just 2 years. Factors: commuter campuses, older students, etc.

CSU Monterey Bay

Some lobbying for 2-year upper division, but the Task Force is pushing for a regular 4-year campus. Presidential search to begin soon. Next year information concerning recruitment of faculty for the campus will be distributed. The faculty is expected to be drawn principally from the present CSU campuses. [Molly Broad assured us that the Monterey Bay budget will not be obtained by hacking out pieces from the other campuses.] CFA has been in on the planning from the outset. Very helpful way of going about it.

Bond issues. Strategy. 1. Restore CA economy. 2. Rural areas in last 10 days with regional campaign. 3. If we wait, we'll pay more later. We're in trouble if we defer investments. Good location on ballot, after 1-A (earthquake), 1-B (K-12).

Budget. Molly Broad feels Governor's budget unrealistic. They'll pass it and then worry about fixing it later. She has argued, however, that a mid-year cut is the most painful and destructive. Business & Finance prepared a very revealing report titled "CSU 1990/1991-1994/95 Funding Gap."

Budget Redesign. We will push for a simple and flexible system—but then demonstrate accountability. A few accountability measures on which each campus is judged, plus allow each campus to define its own distinct goals & measures.

Tom Hayden & charges of CSU fraud. Molly Broad has soothed the waters some. Dot Goldish, Chair of Long Beach, published a response in *LA Times*, April 2, 1994.

Project Delta. Distance learning is adjunct to conventional instruction, not replacement. Faculty is cautious, administration is gung-ho.

This resolution replaces the resolution of the same name under Business Item V.C. in your May 3, 1994 agenda.

Memo - Exec 4/26/94

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

AS- -94
RESOLUTION ON
REVISION OF THE FACULTY CODE OF ETHICS

Background Statement: Throughout the last several years, criticism has been received informally that the existing Faculty Code of Ethics is awkwardly written and lacks the force of law in that it does not appear in the Campus Administrative Manual.

During Spring 1993, interested members of the Personnel Policies Committee worked on revising the existing Code to remove the awkward "he/she" phraseology, make the Code gender-neutral, and thereby made it more readable and meaningful.

Due to the illness of the Committee Chair (in April 1993) and the reluctance of a majority of the members of the Committee to meet in May 1993, work on the revised Code was not completed. By a memo dated October 25, 1993, Jack Wilson referred the matter to us once again for formal consideration. The PPC approved (February 16, 1994) a resolution to adopt the revised Faculty Code of Ethics and include it in CAM.

After considering the American Association of University Professors' Statement of Ethics (revised, 1987), the PPC did not see any significant difference between its revision and the AAUP's revision. The PPC voted (April 20, 1994) to adopt the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics as the Faculty Code of Ethics for this campus.

The Personnel Policies Committee unanimously endorsed the resolution /document which follows. For your ease of reading, please note: Attachment 1 is the existing Faculty Code of Ethics and Attachment 2 is the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement of Professional Ethics (revised, 1987).

AS- -94
RESOLUTION ON
REVISION OF THE FACULTY CODE OF ETHICS

WHEREAS, The original Faculty Code of Ethics was based on the 1966 AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics; and

WHEREAS, The present "he/she" format is difficult to read; and

WHEREAS, The present Faculty Code of Ethics appears on pages 1 and 2 of the Faculty Handbook; and

WHEREAS, Official campus policy should be included in the Campus Administrative Manual; and

WHEREAS, The AAUP has developed a national standard for professional ethics and responsibility which has been adopted by many institutions of higher education; and

WHEREAS, The AAUP has revised its Statement on Professional Ethics in 1987; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics (revised, 1987) be adopted as the Faculty Code of Ethics for this campus; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That this Faculty Code of Ethics shall be included in the Campus Administrative Manual as CAM 370.TBD.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Personnel Policies Committee
April 20, 1994

Vote: 5 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain
(2 absent)

Statement on Professional Ethics

The statement that follows, a revision of a statement originally adopted in 1966, was approved by Committee B on Professional Ethics, adopted by the Council as Association policy, and endorsed by the Seventy-third Annual Meeting in June 1987.

INTRODUCTION

From its inception, the American Association of University Professors has recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. The Association has consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in such matters as their utterances as citizens, the exercise of their responsibilities to students and colleagues, and their conduct when resigning from an institution or when undertaking sponsored research.¹ The *Statement on Professional Ethics* that follows sets forth those general standards that serve as a reminder of the variety of responsibilities assumed by all members of the profession.

In the enforcement of ethical standards, the academic profession differs from those of law and medicine, whose associations act to assure the integrity of members engaged in private practice. In the academic profession the individual institution of higher learning provides this assurance and so should normally handle questions concerning propriety of conduct within its own framework by reference to a faculty group. The Association supports such local action and stands ready, through the general secretary and Committee B, to counsel with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire into complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of adverse action, the procedures should be in accordance with the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, the 1958 *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings*, or the applicable provisions of the Association's *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.

THE STATEMENT

I. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge,

recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

II. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

III. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

IV. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

V. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

¹1961 *Statement on Recruitment and Resignation of Faculty Members*
1964 *Committee A Statement on Extramural Utterances* (Clarification of sec. 1c of the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*)
1965 *On Preventing Conflicts of Interest in Government-Sponsored Research at Universities*
1966 *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*
1967 *Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students*
1970 *Council Statement on Freedom and Responsibility*
1976 *On Discrimination*
1984 *Sexual Harassment: Suggested Policy and Procedures for Handling Complaints*

FACULTY CODE OF ETHICS

The following Faculty Code of Ethics was developed by the Academic Senate and approved by the President:

The professor, guided by a deep conviction of worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge recognizes the special responsibilities placed upon him/her. His/her primary responsibility to his/her subject is to seek and state the truth as he/she sees it. To this end, he/she devotes his/her energies to developing and improving his/her scholarly competence. He/she accepts the obligation to exercise self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. He/she practices intellectual honesty. Although he/she may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise his/her freedom of inquiry.

As a teacher, the professor encourages the free pursuit of learning in his/her students. He/she holds before them the best scholarly standards of his/her discipline. He/she demonstrates respect for the student as an individual, and adheres to his/her proper role as intellectual guide and counselor. He/she makes every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that his/her evaluation of students reflects their true merit. He/she respects the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. He/she avoids any exploitation of students for his/her private advantage and acknowledges significant assistance from them. He/she protects their academic freedom.

As a colleague, the professor has obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. He/she respects and defends the free inquiry of his/her associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas, he/she shows due respect for the opinions of others. He/she acknowledges his/her academic debts and strives to be objective in his/her professional judgment of colleagues. He/she accepts his/her share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of his/her institution.

As a member of his/her institution, the professor seeks, above all, to be an effective teacher and scholar. Although he/she observes the stated regulations of the institution, provided they do not contravene academic freedom, he/she maintains his/her right to criticize and seek revision. He/she determines the amount and character of the work he/she does outside his/her institution with due regard to his/her paramount responsibilities within it. When considering the interruption or termination of his/her service, he/she recognizes the effect of his/her decision upon the program of the institution and gives due notice of his/her intentions.

As a member of his/her community, the professor has the rights and obligations of any citizen. He/she measures the urgency of these obligations in the light of his/her responsibilities to his/her subject, to his/her students, to his/her profession, and to his/her institution. When he/she speaks or acts as a private person he/she avoids creating the impression that he/she speaks or acts for his/her college or university. As a citizen engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, the professor has a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

5220-Exec 4/26/94
AS-2193-94/AA(REV.)
March 10-11, 1994

Support for SB 2061 (Hart): Public Employees' Health Benefits:
Domestic Partners

- WHEREAS, The exclusion of domestic partners of the same or opposite sex and their dependents from employee benefits packages constitutes discrimination against employees solely on the basis of their nontraditional family status; and
- WHEREAS, Senator Gary Hart (with principal co-author Assemblyman Richard Katz) has proposed enabling legislation [SB 2061 (Hart): Public Employees' Health Benefits: Domestic Partners] which would permit the Public Employment Retirement System to contract with agencies that provide health benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and
- WHEREAS, A large and growing number of higher education institutions (e.g., Harvard, Columbia, Yale, MIT, Stanford, and the Universities of Chicago and Minnesota) have amended their employee benefits programs to provide employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and
- WHEREAS, Over 136 major corporations in the United States (including AT&T, Apple, Microsoft, Bank of America, Levi Strauss, PG&E, MCA, HBO, Sprint, Time Magazine, Warner Brothers) provide employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and
- WHEREAS, Cities such as San Francisco, Berkeley, and Seattle provide employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University support SB 2061 (Hart): Public Employees' Health Benefits: Domestic Partners which will permit the Public Employees Retirement System to contract with agencies that provide employee health benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and be it further

(over)

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates to support AB 2811 (Katz): Domestic Partners Health Care which would permit the Public Employees Retirement System to provide employee health benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to work with the California Faculty Association to support the enabling legislation. SB 2061 (Hart): Public Employees' Health Benefits Domestic Partners, which would permit the Public Employees Retirement System to contract with agencies that provide employee health benefits to domestic partners and their dependents:

SECOND READING -- May 5-6, 1994

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

(6)

AS-2196-94/AA(REV.)
March 10-11, 1994

Extension of Employee Benefits in the California State University to
Domestic Partners and their Dependents

- WHEREAS, The current employment contract negotiated by the California Faculty Association (CFA) and the California State University (CSU) affords benefits only to blood-related families and those specific relationships traditionally recognized in civil courts; and
- WHEREAS, The exclusion of domestic partners of the same or opposite sex and their dependents from employee benefits packages constitutes discrimination against employees solely on the basis of their nontraditional family status; and
- WHEREAS, A large and growing number of higher education institutions (e.g., Harvard, Columbia, Yale, MIT, Stanford, and the Universities of Chicago and Minnesota) have amended their employee benefits programs to provide benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and
- WHEREAS, Over 136 major corporations in the United States (including AT&T, Apple, Microsoft, Bank of America, Levi Strauss, PG&E, MCA, HBO, Sprint, Time Magazine, Warner Brothers) provide employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and
- WHEREAS, Cities such as Seattle, San Francisco, and Berkeley provide employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University declare its recognition of the legitimacy of domestic partnerships and support the extension of employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and be it further

(over)

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates to declare the legitimacy of domestic partnerships and to support the extension of employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to work with the California Faculty Association to redress the fundamental unfairness of policies that exclude domestic partners and their dependents from employee benefits; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the California Faculty Association to bargain for agreements with the California State University that afford domestic partners and their dependents those employee benefits currently available only to blood-related families and those specific relationships traditionally recognized in civil court.

SECOND READING -- May 5-6, 1994

71005
394

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

11

AS-2205-94/AA
May 5-6, 1994

Support for AB 2810 (Katz): Domestic Partnership: Registration,
Termination, and Rights Thereof

- WHEREAS, The exclusion of domestic partners of the same or opposite sex and their dependents from employee benefits packages, hospital visitation rights, from conservatorship rights, and the right to Will property to one another constitutes discrimination against employees solely on the basis of their nontraditional family status; and
- WHEREAS, Assemblyman Richard Katz has proposed legislation [AB 2810 (Katz): Domestic Partnership: Registration, Termination, and Rights Thereof] which would define domestic partners, including the qualifications for establishing and terminating partnerships, and create a statewide registry for domestic partners and would provide hospitalization rights, conservatorship rights, and the right to Will property to domestic partners; and
- WHEREAS, The provisions AB 2810 (Katz) would benefit members of the CSU community who live in nontraditional families; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University support AB 2810 (Katz): Domestic Partnership: Registration, Termination, and Rights Thereof which defines domestic partners, including the qualifications for establishing and terminating partnerships, creates a statewide registry for domestic partners, and provides hospitalization rights, conservatorship rights, and the right to Will property to domestic partners; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates to support AB 2810 (Katz): Domestic Partnership: Registration, Termination, and Rights Thereof; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor, California State University Board of Trustees and the California Faculty Association to support AB 2810 (Katz): Domestic Partnership: Registration, Termination, and Rights Thereof.

Adopted:

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

AS- -94/
RESOLUTION ON
REVISION OF THE FACULTY CODE OF ETHICS

*replaced w/
attached
resolution*

Background Statement: Throughout the last several years, criticism has been received informally that the existing Code of Ethics is awkwardly written and lacks the force of law in that it does not appear in the Campus Administrative Manual.

During spring 1993, interested members of the Personnel Policies Committee worked on revising the existing Code to remove the awkward "he/she" phraseology, make the Code gender-neutral, and thereby make it more readable and meaningful.

Due to the illness of the committee chair (in April 1993) and the reluctance of a majority of the members of the committee to meet in May 1993, work on the revised Code was not completed. By a memo dated October 25, 1993, Jack Wilson referred the matter to us once again for formal consideration.

By a vote of 6-0-0, the Personnel Policies Committee endorsed the resolution/document which follows. For your ease of reading, please note: Attachment 1 is the existing Faculty Code of Ethics and Attachment 2 is the revised Faculty Code of Ethics (with optional headings). Please choose which you prefer.

WHEREAS, The original Faculty Code of Ethics was taken from an earlier document and redrafted to remove reference to male gender; and

WHEREAS, The present "he/she" format is difficult to read; and

WHEREAS, The present Faculty Code of Ethics appears on pages 1 and 2 of the Faculty Handbook; and

WHEREAS, Official campus policy should be included in the Campus Administrative Manual; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Code of Ethics shall be rewritten in gender-neutral language as indicated on the attached page; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the revised Faculty Code of Ethics shall be included in the Campus Administrative Manual as CAM 370.TBD.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Personnel
Policies Committee
February 16, 1994