

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

FILE COPY

ERRATUM

Should be Monday

Executive Committee  
Academic Senate Agenda  
Tuesday September 11, 1989  
UU 219 1:00-2:30 p.m.

Member  
Andrews, Charles  
Borland, James  
Boynton, William  
Dobb, Linda  
Freberg, Laura  
Gooden, Reg  
Kersten, Timothy  
Lutrin, Sam (VC)  
Moustafa, Safwat

Dept  
Acctg  
ConstMgt  
Acctg  
Library  
Psy/HD  
PoliSci  
Economics  
StL&Actvs  
MechEngr

Member  
Murphy, James (C)  
Murphy, Paul  
Simmons, James  
Vilkitis, James (Secty)  
Weatherby, Joseph  
Wilson, Malcolm  
Copies: Warren Baker  
William Rife  
Howard West

Dept  
IndTech  
Math  
English  
NRM  
PoliSci  
VPAA

- I. Minutes: Approval of the July 18, 1989 Executive Committee minutes (pp. 2-3).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:  
A. President's Office  
B. Vice President's Office  
C. Statewide Senators
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):  
A. Resolution on State Faculty Support Grants-Moustafa, Chair of the Research Committee, Second Reading (pp. 4-18).  
B. Review of committee charges for 1989-1990 and distribution of assigned time for committee chairs (p. 19). (30 WTU's [.667 FTEF] to be distributed among the following chairs: Budget, Curriculum, GE&B, Long-Range Planning, Personnel Policies, Research, and UPLC.)  
C. Vacancies:  
1. SAGR caucus chair  
2. Academic Senate parliamentarian  
3. Academic Senate representative for part-time faculty  
4. SLA Academic Senate fall replacements for Mori and Zeuschner  
5. GE&B Area "E" (Physio, Soc, Psy Dev) - one vacancy  
6. Committee vacancies:  
SAED - Instruction, Status of Women  
SBUS - Status of Women, Student Affairs  
SENG - Library  
SLA - Const & Byls (fall qtr), Fairness Board  
SPSE - Const & Byls, Elections, GE&B (replacement for Murphy), Fairness Board (replacement for Fields), Long-Range Planning, Personnel Policies  
SSM - Status of Women  
Representative of the part-time faculty to the Status of Women Committee
- VI. Discussion Item(s):  
Academic Senate goals and direction for 1989-1990 and beyond. Please be prepared to discuss your ideas/suggestions re Senate goals and direction and the implementation of same.
- VII. Adjournment:

7.18.89  
minutes  
removed

Adopted: \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Background Statement:**

In 1988-89, the State Faculty Support Grant (SFSG) program was funded for the first time. In August of 1988, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate approved provisional guidelines for the first grant cycle.

The Academic Senate revised its bylaws so that the Research Committee could be elected and be eligible to review SFSG proposals in the next cycle. The Senate also asked the Committee to review and revise the guidelines as appropriate, and to report on these changes.

The Research Committee has reviewed the guidelines and revised them to bring them into compliance with Chancellor's Office regulations promulgated after the interim guidelines were approved. Other than these changes, no substantive changes have been made.

AS-\_\_\_\_-89/\_\_\_\_

RESOLUTION ON

STATE FACULTY SUPPORT GRANTS

Whereas the State Faculty Support Grant guidelines have been revised by the Academic Senate Research Committee; and

Whereas the changes have been minor, intended to bring the interim guidelines into compliance with late instructions from the Chancellor's Office; and

Whereas the interim guidelines adopted last year by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate functioned well to assure the responsible distribution of State funds for research, scholarship, and creative activity, be it therefore

Resolved: that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate approves the attached guidelines of the State Faculty Support Grant for distribution to faculty.

Proposed by: Research Committee  
On: June 6, 1989

## PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF STATE FACULTY SUPPORT GRANTS

California Polytechnic State University  
San Luis Obispo, California

Preliminary guidelines were drafted by the Academic Senate Research Committee and approved by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. After the June 14, 1988, coded memorandum AAP 88-26 clarified that the review process must be developed by an elected committee, the Academic Senate revised its bylaws to make the Academic Senate Research Committee an elected body.

The Academic Senate Research Committee (ASRC) revised the original guidelines (Attachment A). The goals of the program as defined in the criteria laid forth by the Chancellor's Office and the State Legislature guide the determination of proposals recommended for award. No set proportions are used for numbers of awards for minigrants, summer fellowships, or quarter leaves. There are no set percentages or minimum awards for each school.

Guidelines will be issued to faculty in the Spring Quarter. Faculty will submit proposals by *Monday, October 2, 1989* to the Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development Office via the department chair and the school dean.

Each proposal will be reviewed first by two peer reviewers. These peer reviewers will be selected by the school/library representative on the ASRC. Copies of proposals will be sent to peer reviewers by *Monday, October 9* with evaluation instructions (Attachment B: memo of instructions and evaluation form).

Peer reviewers evaluate proposals and send evaluation sheets to the Graduate Studies and Research Office by *Monday, October 23*. A log of proposals will be compiled and distributed to the committee with copies of peer reviewer sheets for that school. The committee convenes to discuss the proposals. If possible, one meeting is allotted to discuss the proposals from each school and the library. Schools are scheduled for presentation starting with those having the smallest number of proposals.

Each school/library representative presents a case for each proposal from that school. The representative summarizes the quality of the proposal and additional criteria for each proposal, identifying special characteristics such as lack of access to external grants, affirmative action status, stage of career/non-tenured status, cost-effectiveness of proposal, and relationship to needs of the state. The committee then judges each proposal on overall merit and grant worthiness and makes (1) unconditional recommendation to fund, (2) conditional recommendation to fund, or (3) recommendation to deny.

After all eight sets of proposals have been discussed, the unconditional recommendations are funded. If there are more unconditional recommendations for funding than dollars available, the committee will start with those that received the lowest scores for quality and eliminate according to those having the fewest special characteristics. The committee will identify alternates for awards in case some recipients turn back their awards.

If funds remain after all unconditional recommendations have been awarded, the conditional recommendations are reviewed and ranked paying particular attention to the special criteria as above. Those with the higher number of special characteristics get priority. If funds remain after these proposals are funded, another grant cycle will be initiated in the Winter Quarter, but only for summer fellowship awards.

Recommendations are made to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by *Tuesday, November 21*. Recommendations for reduced awards are negotiated by the Associate Vice President. Award notifications are made by the end of the Fall Quarter.

**1989/90  
STATE FACULTY SUPPORT GRANTS**

**Schedule of Events**

<i>6/15/89</i>	Guidelines distributed.
<i>7/18/89</i>	Adopted by the Academic Senate Executive Committee (as Senate)
<i>9/12/89</i>	Meeting with faculty to discuss guidelines - Fall Conference.
<i>10/2/89</i>	Campus deadline.
<i>10/3/89</i>	Proposals sent to ASRC representatives to select peer reviewers.
<i>10/9/89</i>	Proposals sent to peer reviewers with rating instructions
<i>10/9/89 - 10/23/89</i>	Peer reviewers review proposals.
<i>10/23/89</i>	Peer reviewers send evaluations to Graduate Studies and Research Office.
<i>10/25/89</i>	Log of proposals and peer review evaluations sent to ASRC.
<i>10/27/89 - 11/17/89</i>	Committee discusses proposals.
<i>11/21/89</i>	Recommendation for awards, alternates, denials sent to Vice President for Academic Affairs
<i>12/8/89</i>	Award notices sent out.



# Memorandum

To : Campus Faculty

Date : June 15, 1989

File No.:

Copies : W. J. Baker  
M. W. Wilson  
School Deans  
D. Walch

From : Robert Lucas, Associate Vice President  
Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development

Subject: STATE FACULTY SUPPORT GRANTS

Attached are guidelines for the State Faculty Support Grant competition for 1989-90. We are distributing them to you now to allow you as much time as possible to prepare your proposals before the deadline of October 2, 1989. We anticipate that the campus will have \$150,000 again next year to distribute in this program.

A Fall Quarter review cycle is mandatory if we are to allow adequate time for you to spend the funds during the 1989/90 academic year. Funding is sufficient to make up to 40 awards.

If you have questions, please contact me at extension 1508. Further information about this competition will be given during Fall Conference at the Workshop on Professional Development Activities, 3:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 12, in University Union 207.

## GUIDELINES FOR STATE FACULTY SUPPORT GRANTS 1989/90

The purpose of the State Faculty Support Grant (SFSG) Program is to support research, scholarship, and creative activities that will help faculty remain current in their disciplines and that will contribute to knowledge that will strengthen California socially, culturally, and economically. Faculty defined as members of Unit 3 are eligible to compete for funding. Non-tenured faculty and those in disciplines with few outside resources for research, scholarship, and creative activity are particularly encouraged to apply. Awards will seek to complement and promote the affirmative action and educational equity goals of the CSU system.

Instructional improvement grants *per se* are not allowed. That is, the program is intended to fund traditional research, scholarship, and creative activities. The grant activity must be related to the generation of new knowledge and learning or, in the case of the arts, to experimentation in techniques and in the production of art works. In the proposal you will need to demonstrate how the research, scholarship, or creative activity will improve you as a teacher and benefit the instructional program. For all State Faculty Support Grants, the overriding criteria for support will be how the proposed activity ultimately enhances student learning. **Deadline for proposals is October 2, 1989.**

### Types of Support

The State Faculty Support Grant program supports activities which advance the discipline or field. These activities will use the approaches of a discipline or field to create new and generalizable knowledge, or to develop new art forms or expressions. The program offers three types of support:

- Minigrants of up to \$5,000, to be expended during the 1989/90 academic year. These grants will allow faculty to test promising ideas and obtain preliminary results prior to seeking external support for an activity. Funds may be used to buy adequate computer time, to pay undergraduate and graduate students as research assistants, to purchase secretarial assistance for typing manuscripts and proposals, or for other similar purposes. Minigrants may not be used to buy equipment (i.e., items that cost more than \$500 and that last more than four years), or to buy assigned time.
- One month (or in unusual circumstances, two month) summer faculty fellowships in the summer of 1990 to provide support to inaugurate, continue, or complete a project of creative scholarship or research. Summer fellowships must begin after the end of the Spring Quarter and before June 30, 1990. While you are holding the Summer Fellowship, you will not be eligible for other additional employment through the CSU or its auxiliaries. (Summer fellowships are taxable income.)
- A quarter leave at full pay in Winter or Spring Quarter, 1990, to develop or complete an appropriate activity related to one's academic discipline. Those accepting a quarter's leave will be required to teach the next two quarters in normal rotation immediately following completion of the leave. These guidelines supersede policies stated in CAM 386.6. Assigned time of less than a full quarter's leave is not an option in the SFSG competition.

You may write a proposal for a single activity that requests support from two different grant categories. For example, you can request a quarter leave, with a minigrant to supply you with materials and supplies. Please note, however, that such a request may become expensive. The review committee will consider cost as an element in its prioritizing of proposals. Also note that it may be difficult logistically to complement a summer fellowship that runs through the middle of August, 1990 with a minigrant that must be expended fully by June 30, 1990.

## **Criteria**

Proposals will be evaluated on the following criteria:

**SIGNIFICANCE:** (Including the importance of the topic; role in advancing the field or discipline; need for or anticipated benefit from the creative activity; contribution of the creative activity in fostering excellence, vitality, and diversity in the arts; impact on student learning; relationship to strengthening the curriculum; contribution to knowledge that will strengthen California socially, culturally, and economically; and relationship to the affirmative action goals of the university.) **MAXIMUM SCORE - 5 POINTS**

**METHODOLOGY:** (Including completeness and precision in detailing such facets as compatibility with stated objectives; overall design or organization; knowledge of related work or implementation of newest findings, time schedule, cost effectiveness of budget. For creative activities, criteria include adequacy of plan for commitment of imagination, thought, and expression in an articulated direction; demonstrated ability to sustain creativity as evidenced by previous work.) **MAXIMUM SCORE - 7 POINTS**

**QUALIFICATIONS OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR AND ADEQUACY OF FACILITIES:** (Including consideration of how well prepared the principal investigator/scholar is to pursue the goals of the grant; considers qualifications, promise, and stage of career development of the principal investigator; the availability of facilities, equipment, or other resources necessary to meet the objectives of the grant. For creative activities, criteria include adequacy of the material conditions necessary to facilitate the creation, production, presentation, or exhibition of innovative and diverse work.) **MAXIMUM SCORE - 5 POINTS**

**POTENTIAL:** (Including consideration of the project's potential for new contributions, or promise of leading to external funding.)  
**MAXIMUM SCORE - 3 POINTS**

## **Proposal Contents**

Each proposal should include a detailed narrative describing the work, a time line for completion of the project, and a statement about how the resources requested are necessary to complete the project. **With the exception of summer fellowships, all funds and salary support must be utilized by June 30, 1990.** Proposals should cover the following topics in order, as appropriate to field or discipline:

1. A description of the project's goals and objectives in non-technical language.
2. A discussion of significance of the project. You should answer the following questions as they are appropriate to your proposed activity.
  - a. What is the importance of the problem or need for the creative activity?
  - b. How does it your relate to teaching assignment? specific courses? new courses?
  - c. How does what you propose enhance student learning?
  - d. What role, if any, will the project play in supporting the university's affirmative action goals?
  - e. If project is a creative activity, how will it foster excellence in, or increase appreciation of, the arts?

3. A detailed plan of work, including methodology, tasks, and time schedule.
  - a. What previous work gives evidence of this project's feasibility?
  - b. How is the design related to objectives?
  - c. What are the tasks? time schedule?
  - d. What facilities or material conditions are needed? are they available?
  - e. What help is needed? What undergraduate and/or graduate student assistance is needed?
4. A description of how research findings will be used, whether for publication in refereed journals, for presentation in artistic exhibitions, for development of curricular materials, or for other purposes.
5. For minigrants, a budget in which line items are clearly related to the activity of the grant. The budget should follow the format below, listing only the applicable categories. Include an explanation for all categories of support requesting more than \$500.

	<u>Amount</u>
Personnel	
Temporary Help	\$ _____
Student Assistant	_____
Graduate Assistant	_____
TOTAL PERSONNEL SERVICES	_____
Operating Expense and Equipment	
Supplies and Services	_____
On-Campus Duplicating	_____
Off-Campus Printing	_____
Travel (In-State)	_____
Travel (Out-of-State)	_____
Other	_____
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSE	_____
GRAND TOTAL	\$ _____

Minigrants must be expended before the end of the fiscal year. Normal state deadline for purchase orders, paying student assistants, and so on, will require that some expenditures be encumbered well before the end of the fiscal year. Ask your department head/chair to help you plan your grant expenditures.

For a summer fellowship, the amount for a one-month award will be the same as the salary payment for the last month (June) of the current academic year. The budget line item for quarter leave salary is calculated at the replacement level; the figure of \$12,850 should be used in all cases. Faculty members who receive quarter leaves, however, will receive their normal salary for the quarter.

If you have submitted or will be submitting this proposal to any other source, internal or external, for full or partial funding, please explain the circumstances fully here.



#### APPENDIX A:

A brief biography, including a personal bibliography, listing universities attended, years, degrees, major field, pertinent work, related research, creative activity, or scholarship. A vita or resume must be attached.

#### APPENDIX B:

List and explanation of the assigned time, sabbaticals, grants, both internal and external, and other monetary awards you have received in the past five years for research, scholarship, and creative activities. You should discuss the availability of grants in your field, specifically in relation to this project. Is outside funding possible at this stage? Later? You may wish to include information about other grant writing efforts you have made or plan to make in relation to your current proposal. If you received a grant for this activity already, how does this proposal differ from it and relate to that grant?

The above narrative and two appendices should be stapled to the cover page, abstract, and significance forms to complete your proposal. The proposal, with original signatures and nine copies of all materials, is due in the Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development Office (Administration 317) by 5:00 p.m. on Monday October 2. If you have questions, please call extension 1508.

#### Review of Proposals

All proposals will be reviewed first by two peer reviewers and then by the Academic Senate Research Committee. Announcements of awards will be made by the end of the Fall Quarter. Minigrants will be effective immediately upon award. Quarter leaves will begin at the start of the leave period. Summer fellowships must begin after the end of the Spring Quarter and before July 31, 1990.

#### Reporting Requirements

Following termination of the grant, a final report with an extended (one to two page) abstract must be filed with the Office of the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development. This report will describe the impact of the results. The extended abstracts will be published in a collection to share the results of the projects with the academic community and others interested in the impact of the State Faculty Support Grant program.

#### Proposal Checklist:

- ☐ Cover page with signatures (Form SFSG1)
- ☐ Abstract (Form SFSG2)
- ☐ Significance and Impact Summary (Form SFSG3)
- ☐ Narrative
- ☐ Appendix A (Resume)
- ☐ Appendix B (Other grants)

STATE FACULTY SUPPORT GRANT PROPOSAL

1989/90  
COVER PAGE

Office Use Only:

r ☐ s ☐ ca ☐

Submit an original and nine copies to:

Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development  
Office, Administration 317, Ext. 1508

Deadline: October 2, 1989

Title of Proposal: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Rank (as of September, 1989): \_\_\_\_\_ Step (Scale 1-20): \_\_\_\_\_

Tenured \_\_\_\_\_ Tenure Track \_\_\_\_\_ Non-tenure Track \_\_\_\_\_

I have taught at the college level \_\_\_\_\_ years as a tenure track faculty member.

Support and Amount requested:

☐ Minigrant \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Project Duration: Beginning \_\_\_\_\_ Ending \_\_\_\_\_

☐ '90 Summer Fellowship ☐ One Month ☐ Two Month \$ \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Quarter Leave \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Wtr or Spr Quarter, 1990 (circle one)

I have received \_\_\_\_\_ will apply for \_\_\_\_\_ sabbatical/leave with difference in pay for  
academic year 1988/89 \_\_\_\_\_ 1989/90 \_\_\_\_\_ 1990/91 \_\_\_\_\_.

Principal Investigator \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

ENDORSED:

Department Head/Chair \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Dean \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

-13-  
**STATE FACULTY SUPPORT GRANT PROPOSAL**  
**1989/90**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Department:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Title of Proposal:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Support and Amount requested:**

☐ Minigrant \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Project Duration: Beginning \_\_\_\_\_ Ending \_\_\_\_\_

☐ '90 Summer Fellowship ☐ One Month ☐ Two Month \$ \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Quarter Leave \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Wtr or Spr Quarter, 1990 (circle one)

**ABSTRACT (250 words - Summarize the project in its entirety, being careful not to simply repeat the introduction and rationale):**

- 14 -  
**SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT SUMMARY**

Project Title \_\_\_\_\_

Project Description \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Anticipated Results (Examples: Scholarly paper, additional external funding; initiation of long-term scholarly activity; completion of scholarly activity; conference presentation; classroom application, etc.) Please explain \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Importance of this research, scholarship, or creative activity to the academic discipline (Note: If campus application asked a similar question, original question and response may be entered here.) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Number of students directly involved in grant activity paid and unpaid:  
enter number \_\_\_\_\_

List of courses taught or to be taught by award recipient that are related to the research project and that may be expected to benefit by it (show course prefix, number, and title, or if course is not now offered, indicate that it is planned):

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



# Memorandum

To : Peer Reviewer

Date : October 9, 1989

File No.:

Copies : 2

From : School Representative  
Academic Senate Research Committee

Subject: STATE FACULTY SUPPORT GRANT PROPOSAL REVIEW

Thank you for agreeing to review State Faculty Support Grant proposals from your school. Attached you will find copies of the proposals for the State Faculty Support Grant Program from members of your school. Also attached are copies of the "Peer Review Evaluation Form" to be used to evaluate each of the enclosed proposals.

## ROLE OF PEER REVIEWERS

Your role as peer reviewer is to evaluate each enclosed proposal utilizing the criteria listed on the review form, in the context described in this memo. Please fill out an evaluation form for each proposal and return all them to the Graduate Studies and Research Office by Monday, OCTOBER 23rd, 1989. Meeting this deadline is very important because of the minimal time available to the committee to complete the review so that awards can be made by the end of the Fall Quarter.

Your evaluation and comments will be used in the deliberations of the Academic Senate Research Committee (ASRC), but will not be the sole criteria used for recommending proposals to be funded.

Please keep the proposals confidential. Since your evaluation is not used for personnel action, your written responses will be kept confidential. If a proposal is turned down, however, general comments about relative areas of weakness will be made without quotation or attribution. These comments will be drawn from the total review process, including the Academic Senate Research Committee's review, and will be shared with writers primarily so they can improve their proposals for future applications.

## CRITERIA ON WHICH TO EVALUATE PROPOSALS

1. The "Peer Reviewer's Evaluation Form" itself contains the four criteria for review. Use these criteria as a checklist while reviewing each proposal. Total score possible varies for each criterion; maximum total score for a proposal is 20.
2. The overall purpose of the State Faculty Support Grant Program is to support research, scholarship, and creative activities that will help faculty remain current in their disciplines, pursue new ways to enrich

Peer Reviewer  
October 9, 1989  
Page 2

student learning, and contribute to knowledge that will strengthen California socially, culturally, and economically.

Instruction improvement grants, per se, are not allowed. That is, this program is intended to fund traditional research, scholarship, and creative activities of the University of California type. We are, however, required to demonstrate how such research strengthens our instructional program. Thus, the funded activity must be one relating to the instructional mission of the faculty member.

#### PROCEDURES

Please check one of the boxes near the bottom of the "Peer Reviewer's Evaluation Form" to record your evaluation of the overall quality of each proposal. If you believe a proposal is particularly strong or deficient in any of the four criteria, please note this in the "comments" section. Comments are essential for the Committee's deliberations.

Consider "quality" as an absolute term, but take it in the context of Cal Poly. That is, if you have three proposals to read, the proposals should not be rated in comparison to each other, but in terms of the quality of research you consider worthwhile and accomplishable at Cal Poly. Please do not rate all proposals high as a favor to your department or school. Last year, when some reviewers rated all the proposals they read as excellent, the university-wide review committee disregarded all their evaluations.

If you have any questions, please call me at \_\_\_\_\_ or Bob Lucas at x1508.

encl: Proposals and blank peer reviewer's evaluation forms

PEER REVIEWER'S EVALUATION FORM  
STATE FACULTY SUPPORT PROGRAM 1989/90

Applicant's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Title of Proposal: \_\_\_\_\_

SCORE

SIGNIFICANCE: MAXIMUM SCORE - 5

(Including the importance of the topic; role in advancing the field or discipline; need for or anticipated benefit from the creative activity; contribution of the creative activity in fostering excellence, vitality, and diversity in the arts; impact on student learning; relationship to strengthening the curriculum; contribution to knowledge that will strengthen California socially, culturally, and economically; and relationship to the affirmative action goals of the university.)

\_\_\_\_\_

METHODOLOGY: MAXIMUM SCORE - 7

(Including completeness and precision in detailing such facets as compatibility with stated objectives; overall design or organization; knowledge of related work or implementation of newest findings, time schedule, cost effectiveness of budget. For creative activities, criteria include adequacy of plan for commitment of imagination, thought, and expression in an articulated direction; demonstrated ability to sustain creativity as evidenced by previous work.)

\_\_\_\_\_

QUALIFICATIONS OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR AND  
ADEQUACY OF FACILITIES: MAXIMUM SCORE - 5

(Including consideration of how well prepared the principal investigator/scholar is to pursue the goals of the grant; considers qualifications, promise, and stage of career development of the principal investigator; the availability of facilities, equipment, or other resources necessary to meet the objectives of the grant. For creative activities, criteria include adequacy of the material conditions necessary to facilitate the creation, production, presentation, or exhibition of innovative and diverse work.)

\_\_\_\_\_

POTENTIAL: MAXIMUM SCORE - 3

(Including consideration of the project's potential for new contributions, or promise of leading to external funding.)

\_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

TOTAL SCORE \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Excellent

☐ Very Good

☐ Good

☐ Fair

☐ Poor

Reviewer's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

## SUMMARY EVALUATION

Title of Proposal: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_

### PEER REVIEWERS:

Score

#1 Evaluation: E VG G F P

\_\_\_\_\_

#2 Evaluation: E VG G F P

\_\_\_\_\_

Proposal Quality: Reviewers' Total Score

\_\_\_\_\_

*Maximum score for each category is two plusses (++):*

limited access to grants \_\_\_\_\_ affirmative action \_\_\_\_\_  
stage of career \_\_\_\_\_ cost/benefit ratio \_\_\_\_\_  
needs of state \_\_\_\_\_

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Library Representative

### ACADEMIC SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

*Comments:*

☐ Unconditional recommendation for grant as requested

☐ Conditional recommendation as follows: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Not Recommended for funding, reasons as follows: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



# CONTINUING COMMITTEE CHARGES FOR 1989-1990

Budget	Ongoing charges include PCP process, lottery funds, AY budget for campus, budget impact of curriculum proposals, and long-range planning for budget cuts. Special projects include (1) revision of the existing "resource requirements" reporting document, (2) development of a systematic method for evaluating PCP's by various committees, and (3) development of a financial contingency plan for continued future financial reductions in budget.
Const & Bylaws	None
Curriculum	(1) study of academic minors, (2) review of course proposals tabled during Spr Qtr '89, (3) delineation of courses as to major, support, GE&B categories, concentrations, emphasis areas, etc. Possible revisions of CAM, (4) prerequisites to graduate courses, enrollments in grad courses, (5) grade prerequisites (C/C-), (6) number of units allowable for project courses (experiential education), (7) consultation with support course departments, (8) review of numerous questions raised during the review of the 1990-92 catalog materials.
DTA	DTA Awards, Trustees' Outstanding Professor Award
Elections	Election of senators, statewide senators, Research/UPLC Committees, and special elections as requested by the President.
Fairness Board	Student grievances
GE&B	(1) ongoing review of GE&B proposals, (2) monitoring of Area F.2 courses, (3) alternate ways of packaging GE&B courses, (4) future assessment of the G.E. Transfer Curriculum once transfer students are admitted under its guidelines.
Instruction	Revise Resolution on Fall Conference Week, (2) review/analyze CAPTURE, (3) review/recommend modifications in the document "Academic Calendar Norms and Definitions," (4) study/recommend changes in the tentative Academic Calendar for 1992-93.
Library	Library funding; ways of generating additional funding.
Long-Range Plg	(1) follow up on past LRPC resolutions, (2) follow up on planning section of WASC self-study, (3) further discussion of committee assignments with Academic Planning Committee and Campus Planning Committee.
Personnel Policies	(1) revision of CAM 34 ___, (2) sale of complimentary texts, (3) evaluation of probationary faculty and lecturers.
Research	(1) CARE grants, (2) Student Research Competition, (3) review/recommendations re Faculty Professional Development Plan...and Sabbatical Leaves.
Status of Women	(1) Sexual Harassment Brochure Resolution, (2) Mentoring Program Resolution.
Student Affairs	(1) priorities for adding courses, (2) excessive daily coursework, (3) change of major process, (4) add/drop resolution, (5) +/- grading option, (6) resolution...nominating students...Research Competition.
UPLC	(1) review/rank leave applications, (2) develop document re "Faculty Professional Development Implementation Plan," (3) resolution re submittal/deadline of leave requests.

# Academic Senate Assigned Time History

	FTEF	WTU's
<u>1986-1987</u>		
Chair	.71	32.0
Secty/UPLC	.13	6.0
Budget	.09	4.0
Curriculum	.18	8.0
PPC	<u>.09</u>	<u>4.0</u>
	1.20	54.0
 <u>1987-1988</u>		
Chair	.500	22.5
Secty	.133	6.0
Budget	.167	7.5
Curriculum	.133	6.0
GE&B	.133	6.0
LRP	.067	3.0
PPC	.133	6.0
Student Affs	.067	3.0
UPLC	<u>.067</u>	<u>3.0</u>
	1.400	63.0
 <u>1988-1989</u>		
Chair	.555	25.0
Vice Chair	.067	3.0 (unused)
Secty	.133	6.0 (3 WTU unused)
Budget	.212	9.5
Curriculum	.212	9.5
GE&B	.133	6.0
LRP		(3 WTU transferred from Vice Chair to Chair of LRP, but it was unused by her as well)
 PPC	<u>.089</u>	<u>4.0</u>
	1.401	63.0