



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

MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, January 3 2012
01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm

- I. Minutes:
Approval of Academic Senate Executive Committee minutes for November 8 and November 29 2011 (pp. 2-4).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair:
 - B. President's Office:
 - C. Provost:
 - D. Statewide Senate:
 - E. CFA:
 - F. ASI:
 - G. Other:
- IV. Business Item(s):
 - A. **Academic Senate/university committees and task force vacancies for 2011-2013: (p. 5).**
 - B. **Appointment of two non-CAED faculty members to the search committee for dean of CAED (please bring names to meeting.)**
 - C. **Resolution on Renaming the Distinguished Scholarship Award, Renaming the Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee, and Updating the Award Description and Criteria:** Bodemer, chair of the Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee (pp. 6-10).
 - D. **Resolution on Changes to the Academic Senate General Education (GE) Governing Board Policy:** Machamer, chair of the GE Governance Board (pp. 11-14).
 - E. **Resolution on Shared Governance:** Archer, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 15-22).
 - F. **Resolution on Direction of Expenditures for the CSU Online Initiative:** Griggs, chair of the Online Task Force (pp. 23-24).
- V. Discussion Item(s):
- VI. Adjournment:

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

MINUTES OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 8 2011
38-114, 3:10 to 5:00pm

- I. Minutes: The minutes of October 11, 2011 were approved as presented.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none.
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair: Fernflores announced that CAED dean, Tom Jones is returning to teaching. A search for a new dean will begin soon.
 - B. President's Office: Kinsley reported that Provost Kathleen Enz Finken, will begin February first.
 - C. Provost: Koob reported that the CSU is revising the enrollment target by including an enrollment floor (16,000 FTES) and a ceiling (16,800 FTES). There are penalties in the form of lost fee and tax support for falling below the floor but no additional funding is available from the state for the 800 FTES above 16,000. Current enrollment is 16,043 FTES. The future enrollment strategy will be to aim below the floor target and use various techniques to reach the target.
 - D. Statewide Senate: Foroohar reported that there is a high level of concern and frustration among statewide senators about top-down initiatives planned by the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Trustees with no meaningful consultation with the faculty. These initiatives including the Graduation Initiative, the Early Start Program, the SB 1440 (Star Act) community college transfer degree, and most recently the CSU on-line initiative. In response to the latest top-down action on the on-line initiative, the statewide senate unanimously approved a resolution "The Faculty Role and Campus Participation in the CSU On-line Initiative," which resolved that "the ASCSU strongly assert that the best on-line programs develop from faculty working in a quality assurance structure which adheres to department, college, and university curricular review procedures" Another resolution "Early Faculty Involvement in California State University (CSU) Initiatives," which was discussed as a first reading item and will return to the senate plenary for voting in January, states that "The pattern of announcing decisions and then asking for faculty help in implementing the initiatives is not what is meant by shared governance."
LoCascio reported that the statewide senate had an extended two-hour meeting to express their concern about the lack of shared governance. The general mood was that faculty were not informed in advance of initiatives already set in motion at the Chancellor's level. The following issues precipitated the discussion: (1) the graduation initiative, which has spurred a discussion on changing the tuition structure of the CSU. (2) The passage of SB1440, which without adequate faculty input, has put the faculty in the position of trying to make an ill-

- conceived law work for students. (3) The "early start" program, which was mandated to begin this summer on each campus with a minimum of a one-unit class in English and Math. (4) The most disturbing issue, CSU on-line initiative.
- E. CFA Campus President: Thorncroft reported that CFA has authorized a one-day strike for Thursday, November 17 at East Bay and Dominguez Hills.
 - F. ASI Representative: Tabrizi reported that the executive committee is considering their travels to DC to lobby on Pell grants successful. Next year tuition will increase by \$498.00.
 - G. Caucus Chairs: none.
 - H. Other: none.
- IV. Consent Agenda: none.
- V. Business Item(s):
- A. **Academic Senate/university committee and task force vacancies for 2011-2013:** The following were approved:

On-line Education Task Force Chair	Ken Griggs, OCOB
On-line Education Task Force	Gary Laver, CLA
Honors Program Task Force	Ken Brown, CLA
 - B. **Resolution on Course Outcomes/Objectives (WASC/Academic Senate Integrated Student Learning Work Group):** Derelian presented this resolution, which requests that all course learning outcomes/objectives be aligned to the program learning objectives, be approved by program faculty, communicated to students, and "publish" on course syllabus. M/S/P to agendize the resolution.
 - C. **Resolution on Academic Senate Executive Committee Attendance and Voting Provision (Executive Committee):** Fernflores presented this resolution, which requests that the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate* be modified to indicate that Executive Committee members may not assign their vote to a proxy or substitute. M/S/P to agendize the resolution.
 - D. **Review and approval of advertisement for Dean, College of Liberal Arts (Fernflores):** an amendment to clarify the composition of the faculty of the CLA was approved. M/S/P to approve as amended.
- VI. Discussion Item: The advertisement for Dean, College of Architecture and Environmental Design was reviewed and minor recommendations were made to Al Liddicoat, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.
- VII. Adjournment: 5:05 pm

Submitted by,


Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate

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

MINUTES OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 29 2011
UU220, 5:10 to 5:30pm

- I. Minutes: none.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none.
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair: none.
 - B. President's Office: none.
 - C. Provost: none.
 - D. Statewide Senate: none.
 - E. CFA Campus President: none.
 - F. ASI Representative: none.
 - G. Caucus Chairs: none.
 - H. Other: none.
- IV. Consent Agenda: none.
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. **Approval of the 2013-2014 Academic Calendar (Instruction Committee):**
Lertwachara, chair of the Instruction Committee, reviewed the committee's recommendations indicated on memorandum dated November 28, 2011 (attached).
M/S/P to approve the recommendations.
- VI. Discussion Item(s): none.
- VII. Adjournment: 5:30 pm

Submitted by,



Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate

ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEE VACANCIES

2011-2013

College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Science

DISTINGUISHED SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS COMMITTEE
INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE (2011-2012)

College of Architecture and Environmental Design

DISTINGUISHED SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS COMMITTEE
GE GOVERNANCE BOARD (2011-2014)
GRANTS REVIEW COMMITTEE
INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE
RESEARCH & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
Need replacement for Marc Neveu 2011-2012

College of Engineering

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE (2011-2012)

Professional Consultative Services

INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

UNIVERSITY-WIDE COMMITTEE VACANCIES

CAL POLY HOUSING CORPORATION BOARD - one vacancy (2011-2013)

CAL POLY PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE – one vacancy (2011-2012)

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY CITIZENSHIP (CUCIT) – two vacancies (2011- 2012 and 2010-2012)

INSTITUTIONAL ANIMAL CARE AND USE COMMITTEE (IACUC) – one vacancy (2010-2013)

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVIEW COMMITTEE – one **CSM vacancy** (2010-2013)

ACADEMIC SENATE APPOINTMENTS TO THE ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COUNCIL

ONE FACULTY MEMBER FROM EACH (3-YEAR TERMS):

College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Science
College of Architecture and Environmental Design
College of Engineering
Orfalea College of Business
Professional Consultative Services

Adopted:

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

AS-__-12

**RESOLUTION ON RENAMING THE DISTINGUISHED SCHOLARSHIP AWARD,
RENAMING THE DISTINGUISHED SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS COMMITTEE, AND
UPDATING THE AWARD DESCRIPTION AND CRITERIA**

Background: The Academic Senate defines scholarship in broad terms as the scholarships of discovery, application, integration, and teaching/learning (AS-725-11). In 2003, the Academic Senate passed AS-602-03/RP&D, Resolution on Establishing a Faculty Award to Recognize Distinguished Research, Creative Activity, and Professional Development at Cal Poly. The Award was administered by the Academic Senate Research and Professional Development Committee. In 2005, the Academic Senate passed AS-638-05, renaming the Award as the Distinguished Scholarship Award and renaming the committee the Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee. Committee membership parameters currently adhere to revisions found in AS 671-08, Resolution on Changes to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate.

- 1 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of Cal Poly has established a “Distinguished Research,
2 Creative Activity and Professional Development Award” (AS-602-03/RP&D); and
3
4 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate resolved to establish a “Distinguished Research, Creative
5 Activity and Professional Development Awards Committee” to conduct the
6 selection process and determine on an ongoing basis the policies and criteria to be
7 used for selecting recipients of the award; and
8
9 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate resolved to rename the “Distinguished Research, Creative
10 Activity and Professional Development Award” the “Distinguished Scholarship
11 Award” (AS-638-05); and
12
13 WHEREAS, The current non-specificity of the title prompts multiple inappropriate nominations
14 of persons other than faculty; and
15
16 WHEREAS, The current criteria require eligible nominees to be current members of the Cal
17 Poly faculty who have completed at least three years of full-time service or its
18 equivalent; and
19
20 WHEREAS, The exemplary accomplishments and outstanding bodies of achievement honored
21 by this Award are produced over a longer period than three years; and
22

23 WHEREAS, The criteria for the Award have not been revised since the Award's original
24 incarnation as the "Distinguished Research, Creative Activity and Professional
25 Development Award"; and
26

27 WHEREAS, The original document outlining "General Guidelines" and "Selection Criteria"
28 appended to AS-602-03/RP&D contains obsolete information regarding
29 committee membership, contradictory to that found in AS-671-08; and
30

31 WHEREAS, The aforementioned "General Guidelines" and "Selection Criteria" of the
32 document will benefit from revision in light of AS-735-11, and can be more
33 succinctly stated in a streamlined revision titled "Award Description and Criteria";
34 therefore be it
35

36 RESOLVED: That the "Distinguished Scholarship Award" be renamed the "Faculty
37 Distinguished Scholarship Award"; and be it further
38

39 RESOLVED: That the "Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee" be renamed the "Faculty
40 Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee"; and be it further
41

42 RESOLVED: That the eligibility criterion of three years of full time service at Cal Poly or its
43 equivalent be extended to five years of full-time service or its equivalent; and be it
44 further
45

46 RESOLVED That the "General Guidelines" and "Selection Criteria" document appended to AS-
47 602-03/RP&D be revised in light of AS-735-11 with other updates in the form of a
48 streamlined document titled "Award Description and Criteria" and appended to
49 this resolution.

Proposed by: Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee
Date: November 10, 2011

Faculty Distinguished Scholarship Award

Revised award description and criteria 11.10.11

Award Description:

The Academic Senate Faculty Distinguished Scholarship Award Committee invites nominations for the Faculty Distinguished Scholarship Award. Each year, two awards are presented, each accompanied by a cash prize of \$1,250.

These awards recognize achievement in scholarship and creative activity across the entire range of disciplines represented at Cal Poly. They honor work conducted primarily at Cal Poly and celebrate both exemplary specific accomplishments and outstanding bodies of achievement.

All nominees must be current members of the Cal Poly faculty and must be active at Cal Poly for at least one quarter during the year in which they are nominated. Faculty members at all career stages are eligible as long as they have completed at least five years of full-time service or its equivalent at Cal Poly.

Faculty, students, staff, and alumni may submit nominations. Faculty members may nominate themselves.

All nominations must be submitted using the online nomination form.

Selection Criteria:

Because this award is intended to recognize the full range of scholarship and creative activity possible at Cal Poly, the criteria listed below are necessarily incomplete. Moreover, it is expected that the work of any given nominee will meet some, but not necessarily all, of these criteria.

1. Quality of the creative or scholarly work as evidenced by any of the following:

- Extensive peer recognition of the work as substantial, seminal, and scholarly
- Contributions to improvements in the human condition and quality of life
- Use of the ideas, techniques, and creative work by industry, practitioners, and others

2. Importance of the scholarly work to students as evidenced by any of the following:

- Influence of the nominee's scholarly and creative work on student learning
- Effectiveness in furthering scholarship and creative activity among students
- Quality and significance of related senior projects, theses, and other student work
- Influence of the work on curriculum improvement and enhanced student learning experiences

3. Importance of the scholarly work to Cal Poly as evidenced by any of the following:

- Enhancement of the reputation of Cal Poly or its academic units
- Significance of grants and contracts received
- Mentoring and facilitating the professional development of other faculty and staff
- Recognition from industry, professional and academic organizations, and other institutions

Faculty Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee Procedures

Committee Description:

The Faculty Distinguished Scholarship Awards (FDSA) Committee oversees the Faculty Distinguished Scholarship Award, an Academic Senate award given yearly to two faculty members. The FDSA Committee advertises the award, screens nominations, and selects two nominees to recommend to the President's Office. The President's Office makes the final selection and notifies the awardees.

The FDSA Committee was established in 2003-2004 as the Distinguished Scholarship Award Committee and originated as a spin-off committee from the Academic Senate Research and Professional Development Committee. The FDSA was originally called the Distinguished Research, Creative Activity and Professional Development Award (AS 602-03/RP&D), then the Distinguished Scholarship Award (AS-638-05), and more recently, The Faculty Distinguished Scholarship Awards [insert new Senate Resolution here].

Committee Membership:

The FDSA Committee preserves the elements of committee membership prescribed for its immediate predecessor, the DSA, as found in the Bylaws and authorized by the Resolution on Changes to the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate* (AS – 671 – 08. VII.B and VIII.I.3. a&b.). The committee includes at least one voting General Faculty from each College and from Professional Consultative Services. *Ex officio* members are the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs and two ASI representatives – one undergraduate and one graduate student. The *ex officio* members are voting, as per VIII.B. of the Bylaws.

Distinguished Scholarship Award Nomination Procedure:

In the fall, nominations are solicited from faculty, staff, students, and alumni by email. All nominations are submitted through an online form on the Academic Senate website. No late submissions are accepted.

The committee chair contacts department and program heads directly to solicit nominations, and the committee members meet with their respective college deans to help publicize the award.

The FDSA Committee believes that the FDSA and DTA, the highest awards for the primary activities of Cal Poly faculty, should work together to promote the achievements of the faculty.

Distinguished Scholarship Award Evaluation Procedure:

After nominations are received, the Academic Senate office screens nominees for eligibility based on the criteria attached to (insert new Senate Resolution here). The FDSA Committee chair then requests a

short CV (five pages maximum) and a short statement (two paragraphs maximum) from all of the eligible nominees.

The committee chair requests the CV and statement by email. If there is no response from the nominee, the chair attempts to contact the nominee by sending an email once more and by calling the nominee's campus phone.

The committee sets a deadline for the receipt of these documents. Documents received after the deadline are not reviewed.

The committee members review the CVs and statements and then meet to discuss them. The committee then selects a group of finalists (typically four to ten people) and requests from these finalists a fuller CV (not to exceed ten pages) and a two-page statement addressing the award criteria.

The committee members then review these materials and the committee chair contacts references. The committee meets to discuss the finalists; generally several meetings are required to achieve consensus.

The committee chair then forwards two names to the President's Office and copies the Academic Senate Office. The President's Office notifies the awardees.

Distinguished Scholarship Award Faculty Colloquium:

Academic Affairs, in consultation with the FDSA Committee, organizes an annual Faculty Distinguished Scholarship Award Colloquium at which the two FDSA recipients from the previous year present short talks about their research. The dates of these colloquia have varied, but the FDSA Committee recommends that the colloquium be held in the fall quarter if possible.

Adopted:

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

AS-__-12

**RESOLUTION ON CHANGES TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE
GENERAL EDUCATION (GE) GOVERNING BOARD POLICY**

1 WHEREAS, In spring 2010, the Academic Senate endorsed a proposal to establish an Academic
2 Senate General Education (GE) Governance Board; and
3

4 WHEREAS, In spring 2010, the then GE director was responsible for GE curricular matters and
5 some administrative GE tasks; and
6

7 WHEREAS, In spring 2010, the then GE director also received release time for both GE
8 curricular matters and some administrative GE tasks; and
9

10 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate General Education Governance Board (GEGB) proposal
11 that was endorsed by the Academic Senate in spring 2010 included some of the
12 responsibilities listed under the duties of the GEGB and the duties of the GEGB
13 chair; and
14

15 WHEREAS, In September 2011, the Office of Programs and Planning appointed a new
16 Associate Vice Provost for Programs and Planning whose responsibilities include
17 some of the same administrative GE tasks currently listed as responsibilities of the
18 GEGB; therefore be it
19

20 RESOLVED: That the Associate Vice Provost for Programs and Planning be responsible for
21 some of these same administrative General Education tasks previously assigned to
22 the Academic Senate General Education Governance Board; and be it further
23

24 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the revised list of responsibilities listed under
25 the General Education Governance Board and the General Education Governance
26 Board Chair in the attached proposal to establish an "Academic Senate General
27 Education Governing Board."

Proposed by: The Academic Senate General Education
Governance Board

Date: December 12 2011

Academic Senate General Education Governing Board

(May 18 2010; Revised December 5 2011)

Responsibility:

Cal Poly's general education (GE) program is the administrative curricular responsibility of the Academic Senate General Education Governing Board (GEGB). GEGB should function like a department with a deep sense of interest and responsibility for overseeing and implementing the GE program.

Charge:

The GEGB is responsible for leading and developing a visionary, high quality GE program that enriches the specialized knowledge acquired in a major program with foundational and integrative understandings of its scientific, humanistic, artistic, and technological contexts. In so doing, the GEGB is responsible for fostering and refining a vision of general education that is responsive to statewide, national, and international values in general education, local campus interests and emphases, and opportunities for positive change.

Duties of GEGB:

The GEGB assists the GEGB Chair in shaping the future and quality of the GE program. In so doing, the GEGB establishes the policies and principles that speak to the vision of the GE program as set out in the charge. Members must be proactive and responsive in reaching out to faculty, departments, and administrators in the University to develop GE curriculum.

Duties include [Renumber final version]:

1. Review and approve GE course proposals.
2. Place GE curriculum proposals on the Academic Senate consent agenda after consultation with the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee.
3. ~~Act on internal and external petitions regarding GE requirements.~~
4. ~~Manage articulation and transfer issues.~~
5. Engage in appropriate assessment activities. Be proactive and responsive to the results of assessment activities.
6. Conduct a GE academic program review on the same cycle as other programs. Findings will be presented to the college deans and the Academic Senate. The GEGB needs to be proactive and responsive to the recommendations that result from academic program review.

Duties of GEGB Chair:

The GEGB Chair will lead the GEGB in the development of the vision of GE and is accountable for making progress toward fulfillment of the GE vision. The GEGB Chair maintains strong oversight of the GE program for quality control at every level. He or she is a constant advocate for a high quality GE program that exposes students to pedagogical experiences they need to be erudite and polymathic.

Duties include [Renumber final version]:

1. Be in regular communication and consultation with the GEGB.
2. Communicate with faculty and advisors to spread understanding of the GE program.
3. Be in regular communication and consultation with the college deans and the Provost about the GE needs of Cal Poly students.
4. Be in regular communication and consultation with the Academic Senate Chair and the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee Chair.
5. Work collaboratively with the college deans, the Office of the Registrar, the GEGB, Academic Programs, and the departments to understand where the demand for courses is and availability of resources in both the short and long term.
- ~~6. Work collaboratively with the college deans, the Office of the Registrar, the GEGB, Academic Programs, and the departments to understand where the demand for courses is.~~
- ~~7. Work collaboratively with the college deans, the Provost, and the GEGB to understand resources.~~
8. Establish ad hoc committees if the GEGB Chair determines that ad hoc committees are needed, for instance for periodic GE assessment purposes or for program review.

Membership and Appointment Procedures of GEGB:

1. The GEGB will be comprised of two faculty members from CLA; two faculty members from CSM; one faculty member from each of the remaining colleges; one student; one member from Professional Consultative Services (PCS); and a GEGB Chair (all voting members, with the exception of the GEGB Chair, who has a tie breaking vote only).
2. The GEGB will also include one representative from the Office of the Registrar (ex officio, non-voting) and one representative from Academic Programs (ex officio, non-voting).
3. Faculty members and PCS representatives on the GEGB shall be members of the General Faculty, as defined in the Constitution of the Faculty.
4. The GEGB chair will serve four-year terms. The GEGB chair will be appointed by the Provost following a recommendation from the Academic Senate Executive Committee and the GEGB.
5. ASI representatives must be able to demonstrate developing expertise in at least one GE area. ASI representatives will be appointed by ASI for one-year terms.
6. All eligible voting members of the GEGB must be able to demonstrate expertise in at least one GE area. The GEGB chair must also be able to demonstrate extensive expertise in and experience with the GE program as a whole. In addition to demonstrable expertise regarding Cal Poly's GE program, all members should have knowledge of CSU GE standards and Title V.
7. GEGB members will serve three-year terms. Faculty members and PCS members on the GEGB will be appointed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee.
8. When ad hoc GE committees are deemed necessary, members should have expertise in the relevant GE areas.

Decisions made by the GEGB:

All GEGB curricula will be available for debate and discussion in the Academic Senate, just as all non-GE curricula are. Appeal processes of curricular decisions made by the GEGB will follow Academic Senate curriculum appeals processes. The GEGB Chair should be involved with any changes to Academic Senate curriculum appeals processes.

Adopted:

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

AS-__-12

RESOLUTION ON SHARED GOVERNANCE

- 1 WHEREAS, One of the key tenets of quality higher education is shared governance in which
2 responsibility for the running of the university is shared by faculty, administrators, and
3 trustees; and
4
- 5 WHEREAS, Cal Poly has a long history of participation in shared governance; and
6
- 7 WHEREAS, The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) "Statement on Governance
8 of Colleges and Universities" (1990) and Academic Senate California State University
9 (ASCSU) "Shared Governance Reconsidered: Improving Decision-Making in the
10 California State University" (2001) characterize the best practices of shared governance;
11 and
12
- 13 WHEREAS, The faculty has an interest in articulating what shared governance means at Cal Poly;
14 therefore be it
15
- 16 RESOLVED: That faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject
17 matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student
18 life which relate to the educational process; and be it further
19
- 20 RESOLVED: On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or
21 delegated by it to the President should be exercised adversely only in exceptional
22 circumstances and for reasons communicated to the faculty; and be it further
23
- 24 RESOLVED: It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity
25 for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the President; and be it
26 further
27
- 28 RESOLVED: Budgets, personnel limitations, timing, and the policies of other groups, bodies, and
29 agencies having jurisdiction over the institution may set limits to realization of faculty
30 advice; and be it further
31
- 32 RESOLVED: The faculty should strive to apply the model of shared governance detailed in Appendix
33 C of the ASCSU report; and be it further
34
- 35 RESOLVED: The Academic Senate set up a task force to revise the *Constitution of the Faculty* to
36 include shared governance in the definition of the functions of the Academic Senate.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: December 6 2011

Shared Governance Reconsidered:
Improving Decision-Making in the California State University.

March 29, 2001

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

2. OVERVIEW

3. NEW DIRECTIONS: TOWARD MORE VITAL SHARED GOVERNANCE

Appendices

A. Views of Experts and Scholars

B. Tables on "Importance of Shared Governance" and Knowledge of Activities"

C. A Model of Shared Governance

D. Positive and Negative Comments on Shared Governance in the CSU

E. Recommendations for Improving Shared Governance from the CSU Survey

F. New faculty and Shared Governance

G. Questionnaire

Additional documents of interest (not attached):

"Collegiality in the California State University System," in *Principles and Policies: papers of the Academic Senate, The California State University*. (Long Beach, California 1985)

Shared Governance in the CSU: Internal Perceptions (preliminary report), January 2001

Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities

The statement that follows is directed to governing board members, administrators, faculty members, students, and other persons in the belief that the colleges and universities of the United States have reached a stage calling for appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action among the components of the academic institution. The statement is intended to foster constructive joint thought and action, both within the institutional structure and in protection of its integrity against improper intrusions.

It is not intended that the statement serve as a blueprint for governance on a specific campus or as a manual for the regulation of controversy among the components of an academic institution, although it is to be hoped that the principles asserted will lead to the correction of existing weaknesses and assist in the establishment of sound structures and procedures. The statement does not attempt to cover relations with those outside agencies that increasingly are controlling the resources and influencing the patterns of education in our institutions of higher learning: for example, the United States government, state legislatures, state commissions, interstate associations or compacts, and other interinstitutional arrangements. However, it is hoped that the statement will be helpful to these agencies in their consideration of educational matters.

Students are referred to in this statement as an institutional component coordinate in importance with trustees, administrators, and faculty. There is, however, no main section on students. The omission has two causes: (1) the changes now occurring in the status of American students have plainly outdistanced the analysis by the educational community, and an attempt to define the situation without thorough study might prove unfair to student interests, and (2) students do not in fact at present have a significant voice in the government of colleges and universities; it would be unseemly to obscure, by superficial equality of length of statement, what may be a serious lag entitled to separate and full confrontation. The concern for student status felt by the organizations issuing this statement is embodied in a note, "On Student Status," intended to stimulate the educational community to turn its attention to an important need.

This statement was jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). In October 1966, the board of directors of the ACE took action by which its council "recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations," and "commends it to the institutions which are members of the Council." The Council of the AAUP adopted the statement in October 1966, and the Fifty-third Annual Meeting endorsed it in April 1967. In November 1966, the executive committee of the AGB took action by which that organization also "recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations," and "commends it to the governing boards which are members of the Association." (In April 1990, the Council of the AAUP adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.)

1. Introduction

This statement is a call to mutual understanding regarding the government of colleges and universities. Understanding, based on community of interest and producing joint effort, is essential for at least three reasons. First, the academic institution, public or private, often has become less autonomous; buildings, research, and student tuition are supported by funds over which the college or university exercises a diminishing control. Legislative and executive governmental authorities, at all levels, play a part in the making of important decisions in academic policy. If these voices and forces are to be successfully heard and integrated, the academic institution must be in a position to meet them with its own generally unified view. Second, regard

for the welfare of the institution remains important despite the mobility and interchange of scholars. Third, a college or university in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems.

2. The Academic Institution: Joint Effort

- a. *Preliminary Considerations.* The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.

Joint effort in an academic institution will take a variety of forms appropriate to the kinds of situations encountered. In some instances, an initial exploration or recommendation will be made by the president with consideration by the faculty at a later stage; in other instances, a first and essentially definitive recommendation will be made by the faculty, subject to the endorsement of the president and the governing board. In still others, a substantive contribution can be made when student leaders are responsibly involved in the process. Although the variety of such approaches may be wide, at least two general conclusions regarding joint effort seem clearly warranted: (1) important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all the institutional components, and (2) differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand, as developed hereinafter.

- b. *Determination of General Educational Policy.* The general educational policy, i.e., the objectives of an institution and the nature, range, and pace of its efforts, is shaped by the institutional charter or by law, by tradition and historical development, by the present needs of the community of the institution, and by the professional aspirations and standards of those directly involved in its work. Every board will wish to go beyond its formal trustee obligation to conserve the accomplishment of the past and to engage seriously with the future; every faculty will seek to conduct an operation worthy of scholarly standards of learning; every administrative officer will strive to meet his or her charge and to attain the goals of the institution. The interests of all are coordinate and related, and unilateral effort can lead to confusion or conflict. Essential to a solution is a reasonably explicit statement on general educational policy. Operating responsibility and authority, and procedures for continuing review, should be clearly defined in official regulations.

When an educational goal has been established, it becomes the responsibility primarily of the faculty to determine the appropriate curriculum and procedures of student instruction.

Special considerations may require particular accommodations: (1) a publicly supported institution may be regulated by statutory provisions, and (2) a church-controlled institution may be limited by its charter or bylaws. When such external requirements influence course content and the manner of instruction or research, they impair the educational effectiveness of the institution.

Such matters as major changes in the size or composition of the student body and the relative emphasis to be given to the various elements of the educational and research program should involve participation of governing board, administration, and faculty prior to final decision.

- c. *Internal Operations of the Institution.* The framing and execution of long-range plans, one of the most important aspects of institutional responsibility, should be a central and continuing concern in the academic community.

Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college or uni-

versity. The channels of communication should be established and maintained by joint endeavor. Distinction should be observed between the institutional system of communication and the system of responsibility for the making of decisions.

A second area calling for joint effort in internal operation is that of decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources. The board, president, and faculty should all seek agreement on basic decisions regarding buildings and other facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution.

A third area is budgeting. The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing board, in the administrative authority of the president, and in the educational function of the faculty. Each component should therefore have a voice in the determination of short- and long-range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short- and long-range budgetary projections. The function of each component in budgetary matters should be understood by all; the allocation of authority will determine the flow of information and the scope of participation in decisions.

Joint effort of a most critical kind must be taken when an institution chooses a new president. The selection of a chief administrative officer should follow upon a cooperative search by the governing board and the faculty, taking into consideration the opinions of others who are appropriately interested. The president should be equally qualified to serve both as the executive officer of the governing board and as the chief academic officer of the institution and the faculty. The president's dual role requires an ability to interpret to board and faculty the educational views and concepts of institutional government of the other. The president should have the confidence of the board and the faculty.

The selection of academic deans and other chief academic officers should be the responsibility of the president with the advice of, and in consultation with, the appropriate faculty.

Determinations of faculty status, normally based on the recommendations of the faculty groups involved, are discussed in Part 5 of this statement; but it should here be noted that the building of a strong faculty requires careful joint effort in such actions as staff selection and promotion and the granting of tenure. Joint action should also govern dismissals; the applicable principles and procedures in these matters are well established.¹

- d. *External Relations of the Institution.* Anyone—a member of the governing board, the president or other member of the administration, a member of the faculty, or a member of the student body or the alumni—affects the institution when speaking of it in public. An individual who speaks unofficially should so indicate. An individual who speaks officially for the institution, the board, the administration, the faculty, or the student body should be guided by established policy.

It should be noted that only the board speaks legally for the whole institution, although it may delegate responsibility to an agent.

The right of a board member, an administrative officer, a faculty member, or a student to speak on general educational questions or about the administration and operations of the individual's own institution is a part of that person's right as a citizen and should not be abridged by the institution.² There exist, of course, legal bounds relating to defamation of character, and there are questions of propriety.

3. The Academic Institution: The Governing Board

The governing board has a special obligation to ensure that the history of the college or university shall serve as a prelude and inspiration to the future. The board helps relate the institution to its chief community: for example, the community college to serve the educational needs of a defined population area or group, the church-controlled college to be cognizant of the announced position of its denomination, and the comprehensive university to discharge the many duties and to accept the appropriate new challenges which are its concern at the several levels of higher education.

The governing board of an institution of higher education in the United States operates, with few exceptions, as the final institutional authority. Private institutions are established by charters; public institutions are established by constitutional or statutory provisions. In private institutions the board is frequently self-perpetuating; in public colleges and universities the present membership of a board may be asked to suggest candidates for appointment. As a whole and individually, when the governing board confronts the problem of succession, serious attention should be given to obtaining properly qualified persons. Where public law calls for election of governing board members, means should be found to ensure the nomination of fully suited persons, and the electorate should be informed of the relevant criteria for board membership.

Since the membership of the board may embrace both individual and collective competence of recognized weight, its advice or help may be sought through established channels by other components of the academic community. The governing board of an institution of higher education, while maintaining a general overview, entrusts the conduct of administration to the administrative officers—the president and the deans—and the conduct of teaching and research to the faculty. The board should undertake appropriate self-limitation.

One of the governing board's important tasks is to ensure the publication of codified statements that define the overall policies and procedures of the institution under its jurisdiction.

The board plays a central role in relating the likely needs of the future to predictable resources; it has the responsibility for husbanding the endowment; it is responsible for obtaining needed capital and operating funds; and in the broadest sense of the term it should pay attention to personnel policy. In order to fulfill these duties, the board should be aided by, and may insist upon, the development of long-range planning by the administration and faculty. When ignorance or ill will threatens the institution or any part of it, the governing board must be available for support. In grave crises it will be expected to serve as a champion. Although the action to be taken by it will usually be on behalf of the president, the faculty, or the student body, the board should make clear that the protection it offers to an individual or a group is, in fact, a fundamental defense of the vested interests of society in the educational institution.³

4. The Academic Institution: The President

The president, as the chief executive officer of an institution of higher education, is measured largely by his or her capacity for institutional leadership. The president shares responsibility for the definition and attainment of goals, for administrative action, and for operating the communications system that links the components of the academic community. The president represents the institution to its many publics. The president's leadership role is supported by delegated authority from the board and faculty.

As the chief planning officer of an institution, the president has a special obligation to innovate and initiate. The degree to which a president can envision new horizons for the institution, and can persuade others to see them and to work toward them, will often constitute the chief measure of the president's administration.

The president must at times, with or without support, infuse new life into a department; relatedly, the president may at times be required, working within the concept of tenure, to solve problems of obsolescence. The president will necessarily utilize the judgments of the faculty but may also, in the interest of academic standards, seek outside evaluations by scholars of acknowledged competence.

It is the duty of the president to see to it that the standards and procedures in operational use within the college or university conform to the policy established by the governing board and to the standards of sound academic practice. It is also incumbent on the president to ensure that faculty views, including dissenting views, are presented to the board in those areas and on those issues where responsibilities are shared. Similarly, the faculty should be informed of the views of the board and the administration on like issues.

The president is largely responsible for the maintenance of existing institutional resources and the creation of new resources; has ultimate managerial responsibility for a large area of nonacademic activities; is responsible for public understanding; and by the nature of the office

is the chief person who speaks for the institution. In these and other areas the president's work is to plan, to organize, to direct, and to represent. The presidential function should receive the general support of board and faculty.

5. The Academic Institution: The Faculty

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.⁴ On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board. Budgets, personnel limitations, the time element, and the policies of other groups, bodies, and agencies having jurisdiction over the institution may set limits to realization of faculty advice.

The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degrees thus achieved.

Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

The faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.

The chair or head of a department, who serves as the chief representative of the department within an institution, should be selected either by departmental election or by appointment following consultation with members of the department and of related departments; appointments should normally be in conformity with department members' judgment. The chair or department head should not have tenure in office; tenure as a faculty member is a matter of separate right. The chair or head should serve for a stated term but without prejudice to reelection or to reappointment by procedures that involve appropriate faculty consultation. Board, administration, and faculty should all bear in mind that the department chair or head has a special obligation to build a department strong in scholarship and teaching capacity.

Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present. An agency should exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty. The structure and procedures for faculty participation should be designed, approved, and established by joint action of the components of the institution. Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty.⁵

The agencies may consist of meetings of all faculty members of a department, school, college, division, or university system, or may take the form of faculty-elected executive committees in departments and schools and a faculty-elected senate or council for larger divisions or the institution as a whole.

The means of communication among the faculty, administration, and governing board now in use include: (1) circulation of memoranda and reports by board committees, the administration, and faculty committees; (2) joint ad hoc committees; (3) standing liaison committees; (4) membership of faculty members on administrative bodies; and (5) membership of faculty members on governing boards. Whatever the channels of communication, they should be clearly understood and observed.

On Student Status

When students in American colleges and universities desire to participate responsibly in the government of the institution they attend, their wish should be recognized as a claim to opportunity both for educational experience and for involvement in the affairs of their college or university. Ways should be found to permit significant student participation within the limits of attainable effectiveness. The obstacles to such participation are large and should not be minimized: inexperience, untested capacity, a transitory status which means that present action does not carry with it subsequent responsibility, and the inescapable fact that the other components of the institution are in a position of judgment over the students. It is important to recognize that student needs are strongly related to educational experience, both formal and informal.

Students expect, and have a right to expect, that the educational process will be structured, that they will be stimulated by it to become independent adults, and that they will have effectively transmitted to them the cultural heritage of the larger society. If institutional support is to have its fullest possible meaning, it should incorporate the strength, freshness of view, and idealism of the student body.

The respect of students for their college or university can be enhanced if they are given at least these opportunities: (1) to be listened to in the classroom without fear of institutional reprisal for the substance of their views, (2) freedom to discuss questions of institutional policy and operation, (3) the right to academic due process when charged with serious violations of institutional regulations, and (4) the same right to hear speakers of their own choice as is enjoyed by other components of the institution.

Notes

1. See the 1940 "Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure," AAUP, *Policy Documents and Reports*, 10th ed. (Washington, D.C., 2006), 3–11, and the 1958 "Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings," *ibid.*, 12–15. These statements were jointly adopted by the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) and the American Association of University Professors; the 1940 "Statement" has been endorsed by numerous learned and scientific societies and educational associations.

2. With respect to faculty members, the 1940 "Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure" reads: "College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution" (*Policy Documents and Reports*, 3–4).

3. Traditionally, governing boards developed within the context of single-campus institutions. In more recent times, governing and coordinating boards have increasingly tended to develop at the multi-campus regional, systemwide, or statewide levels. As influential components of the academic community, these supra-campus bodies bear particular responsibility for protecting the autonomy of individual campuses or institutions under their jurisdiction and for implementing policies of shared responsibility. The American Association of University Professors regards the objectives and practices recommended in the "Statement on Government" as constituting equally appropriate guidelines for such supra-campus bodies, and looks toward continued development of practices that will facilitate application of such guidelines in this new context. [Preceding note adopted by the AAUP's Council in June 1978.]

4. With regard to student admissions, the faculty should have a meaningful role in establishing institutional policies, including the setting of standards for admission, and should be afforded opportunity for oversight of the entire admissions process. [Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 2002.]

5. The American Association of University Professors regards collective bargaining, properly used, as another means of achieving sound academic government. Where there is faculty collective bargaining, the parties should seek to ensure appropriate institutional governance structures which will protect the right of all faculty to participate in institutional governance in accordance with the "Statement on Government." [Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 1978.]

Adopted:

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

AS-__-12

**RESOLUTION ON DIRECTION OF EXPENDITURES
FOR THE CSU ONLINE INITIATIVE**

- 1 WHEREAS, Faculty have primacy over the curriculum and have specialized knowledge of the
2 skills and subject matter pertaining to their respective disciplines and the expertise
3 and experience to determine which particular pedagogical methods can most
4 effectively convey those skills and that subject matter to their students; and
5
- 6 WHEREAS, The success of a system-wide online initiative depends crucially on widespread
7 faculty involvement, engagement and consultation at all stages of its development;
8 and
9
- 10 WHEREAS, Well-designed and executed online programs can be a useful addition to the variety
11 of pedagogical methods available to faculty; and
12
- 13 WHEREAS, A CSU system-wide initiative can offer potential benefits (1) in the financing and
14 marketing of online programs due to economies of scale, (2) in serving as a
15 repository of best practices developed at several CSU campuses, and (3) in
16 creating opportunities for inter-campus collaborations; and
17
- 18 WHEREAS, A system-wide online initiative must address in a clear and transparent manner
19 core issues including but not limited to (1) the intellectual property rights of
20 faculty, (2) the quality and effectiveness of online courses, programs, and degrees,
21 (3) faculty involvement in curriculum development, approval, and oversight, (4)
22 student, faculty, and program assessment, and (5) the scope and nature of online
23 offerings in comparison to traditional modes of delivery; and
24
- 25 WHEREAS, Faculty working at their individual campuses within their particular disciplines who
26 have immediate knowledge both of the demands of those disciplines and the needs
27 of their students are expected to develop their own courses and programs for the
28 traditional classroom; the same should be held with regard to online courses; and
29
- 30 WHEREAS, Faculty need far greater clarity concerning the core issues (listed above) and other
31 issues than were provided during the CSU Online Webcast of November 26 2011,
32 during which several important issues were deferred to the newly hired Executive
33 Director for the CSU Online initiative; and
34

WHEREAS, Although faculty consultation conducted thus far is described as “broad-based” on the CSU Online website, only 10 of 23 campuses were consulted; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, call upon the Chancellor to give top priority in all short-term expenditures related to the development of CSU Online to obtaining broad-based faculty consultation and active involvement across all 23 CSU campuses that addresses the multiple and subtle core issues related to the development of CSU Online; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, call upon the Chancellor to ensure the CSU neither enters into any contracts with external service providers for CSU Online nor incurs any significant expenditures other than for the purpose of faculty consultation until consensus has been reached among all 23 campus Senates on a clear and transparent plan for CSU Online; and be it further

RESOLVED That copies of this resolution be distributed among CSU campus Senate Chairs, the Executive Committee of the CSU Academic Senate, Chancellor Charles B. Reed, Executive Vice Chancellor Ephraim P. Smith, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer Benjamin F. Quillian, the Technology Steering Committee Presidents (Karen Haynes, Jolene Koester, Rollin Richmond, Richard Rush, John Welty, F. King Alexander, Jeff Armstrong, Millie Garcia, Paul Zingg), and members of the CSU Board of Trustees.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Online Task Force
Date: December 11 2011