



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

**MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**Tuesday, February 21 2012**  
**01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm**

- I. Minutes:  
**Approval of Academic Senate Executive Committee minutes for January 24 2012**  
(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:** (pp. 5-6).
  - B. **Resolution on Shared Governance:** Graham Archer, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 7-13).
  - C. **Resolution on Academic Senate Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee Procedures:** Brett Bodemer, chair of the DSA Committee (pp. 14-18).
  - D. **Resolution on Concentration Definition:** Andrew Schaffner, chair of the Curriculum Committee (pp. 19-20).
- 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, January 24 2012**  
**01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm**

- I. Minutes: The minutes of January 3, 2012 were approved as presented.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none.
- III. Reports:
  - A. Academic Senate Chair: Fernflores announced that Ruth Black, Director for the new CSU On-line Initiative, is scheduled to attend the February 28 Academic Senate meeting. In addition, details are being worked out for possible visits from Faculty Trustee Bernadette Cheyne and Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom.
  - B. President's Office: Kinsley reported that CSU Trustee Margaret Fortune will be visiting Cal Poly on April 10, 2012. The CSU Student Trustee will be attending the CSSA meeting in May. On February 29, all students will be asked to vote on the student success fee in a referendum. More information and the schedule of forum dates is available at [www.my.calpoly.edu](http://www.my.calpoly.edu).
  - C. Provost: Koob announced that the Academic Senate Budget and Long Range Planning Committee met with staff from the Provost's Office to discuss and identify elements of a new budget model. In addition, Provost Koob thanked everyone for their commitment and civility in which Academic Senate business is conducted and reiterated what a pleasure it has been to serve on the Academic Senate.
  - D. Statewide Senate: Foroohar reported that due to a reduction in assigned time of the statewide senators, two statewide senators have resigned and several others have chosen to reduce their participation in standing committees. There has been an ongoing debate between the CSU and the Chancellor's Office on the role of faculty in initiatives with major impact over curricular issues. The majority of senators have voiced frustration with top-down management style and lack of consultation with faculty over curricular issues. The Chancellor's advocacy for more secrecy in the selection process of campus presidents, despite ASCSU opposition; and his refusal to accept the ASCSU constitutional amendment to strengthen the protection of academic freedom, are other issues adding to the frustration. The CSU Faculty Affairs Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee had drafted resolutions of vote-of-no-confidence on the Chancellor's leadership. The ongoing debate in standing committees and the senate plenary resulted in several developments:
    - (1) The Chancellor agreed on a base budget for the ASCU for 2012-13 that fully supports two senators from each campus.
    - (2) The Chancellor and two of the vice-chancellors admitted their responsibility in mishandling ASCSU constitutional amendment on academic freedom, and all apologized for the mistakes.
    - (3) The Chancellor's Office legal counsel, Christine Helwick, met with the Faculty Affairs Committee and offered to work with the members to rectify the problems in handling the constitutional amendment and to work with them to propose a language acceptable to both the faculty and the Board of Trustees.
    - (4) The newly hired Executive Director of Cal State On-line, Ruth Black, met with the senators at the plenary and expressed her intention to look to faculty to provide leadership on the curriculum, and work closely with the online initiative's board of



directors, which includes three statewide senators, to develop the program. (5) The ASCSU met in a Meeting of the Committee of the Whole and decided to form a subcommittee to discuss the future of shared governance in the CSU and make recommendations to the senate. The next ASCSU plenary is scheduled for March 15 and 16.

LoCascio announced that the statewide Academic Affairs Committee has finished a white paper on the on-line initiative. Full report of the January 18-20 meeting is available at: [http://academicsenate.wcms.calpoly.edu/sites/academicsenate.wcms.calpoly.edu/files/minutes/11-12\\_minutes/statewide\\_senator\\_012412.pdf](http://academicsenate.wcms.calpoly.edu/sites/academicsenate.wcms.calpoly.edu/files/minutes/11-12_minutes/statewide_senator_012412.pdf)

- E. CFA Campus President: Thorncroft reported that contract negotiations continue without a timeline. A meeting will be schedule with George Deiehr, Vice President CalPERS Board of Administration, to discuss retirement and benefits.
- F. ASI Representative: Titus reported that ASI is working with various student groups on a document that explains the principles and values that guide decisions and actions of Cal Poly Mustangs. The ASI Alumni Association is holding its First Annual ASI Leadership Forum on February 25 and 26 to present the new ASI Alumni Association, Mentorship Program, and Leadership Fund. President Armstrong will be attending a portion of the event. ASI has created the Find Your Connection Campaign with the hope to educate students on all that ASI has to offer and how to become involved in different areas of ASI, including Student Government since every student is a member of ASI.
- G. Caucus Chairs: none.
- H. Other: Fernflores reviewed the report from the Instruction Committee on its charge to discuss the merit of grade inflation and the implementation of student ranking is available at [http://academicsenate.wcms.calpoly.edu/sites/academicsenate.wcms.calpoly.edu/files/disbanding task force.pdf](http://academicsenate.wcms.calpoly.edu/sites/academicsenate.wcms.calpoly.edu/files/disbanding_task_force.pdf)

IV. Consent Agenda: none.

V. Business Item(s):

- A. **Academic Senate/university committees and task force vacancies for 2011-2013:**  
The following appointment was approved:  
GE Governance Board Bruno Giberti, Architecture
- B. **Resolution on General Education C5 Elective (General Education Governance Board):** Machamer presented this resolution, which requests that the Academic Senate approve the proposal for a defined C5 Elective Area for majors within CAFES, CAED, CSM, and OCOB allowing students to receive GE credit for intermediate courses in language other than English that have a substantial cultural component. 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 allows the college caucus to designate a substitute to serve on the Executive Committee. M/S/P to agendize the resolution.
- D. **Resolution on Corporate Relations in the Classroom (Instruction Committee):** Lertwachara presented this resolution, which request that instructors ensure that guest speaker's presentations are pertinent to the course content and that students are communicated that the presence of the guest speaker does not imply endorsement by the instructor or Cal Poly of the guest speaker's opinions, views, or affiliation. M/S/F to agendize the resolution.

VI. Discussion Item(s):

- A. **Report by the Disbanding Policies Task Force:** Greenwald reported that the task force was charged with the development of a resolution that sets out a process for disbanding policies put in place by the Academic Senate that the university no longer abides by. The charge was broken down into three areas: (1) consultation, (2) implementation of approved resolutions, and (3) faculty code. Neill reported that developing a faculty code would build awareness for faculty and could be a resource for faculty to consult when ambiguous situations arise. It was decided that the task force would continue to work on the issue of faculty code. The report is available on pages 31-35 of the January 24 agenda.

VII. Adjournment: 5:04 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  
GRANTS REVIEW COMMITTEE  
RESEARCH & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (2011-2012)

### **College of Engineering**

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE (2011-2012)

### **College of Science & Math**

INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

### **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)

Samuel Frame, Statistics, Tenured Track

Because of our current budget situation, optimally allocating the Cal Poly Plan funds will be a critical component of maintaining quality services to the students we serve. As the chair of the Academic Senate Budget and Long Range Planning Committee, I have experience working cooperatively with administration personnel to understand critical resource shortcomings and complicated budget allocation methods. I will be able to understand and fairly judge Cal Poly Plan funding proposals.

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**

College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Science

Doris Derelian, Food Science and Nutrition (8.5 years at Cal Poly) Tenured \*

Since participating so actively in the WASC accreditation process, I realize the importance of fully implementing the identified assessment activities the campus needs. My doctorate is in educational psychology/evaluation so I feel especially qualified to assist in assessment planning and processes. Several of my evaluation concepts have been utilized on campus including through CTL so I feel I can continue that involvement by participating on the AAC.

College of Architecture and Environmental Design

College of Engineering



Orfalea College of Business

**Dan Villegas, Economics, Tenured (24 years at Cal Poly)**

I have been involved in the following committees that deal with assessment and the curriculum:

College of Business Undergraduate Programs Committee (2005-10, current) - Economics  
Assessment Committee (2007-current, Chair) - Diversity Learning Objectives (DLO) Assessment  
Committee (2009-11, Chair) - Academic Senate Ad Hoc Committee for Review of the General  
Education Program (2009-10) - Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (2006-10)

I maintain my interest in the assessment of student learning and in working towards a curriculum  
that fulfills the promise of higher education and Cal Poly's learning objectives. I hope that I can  
contribute to the work of the Academic Assessment Council.

Professional Consultative Services

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, staff, students,  
3 administrators, and 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 Academic Senate realizes that budgets, personnel limitations, time constraints, and  
14 the policies of other groups, bodies, and agencies having jurisdiction over the institution  
15 may set limits to realization of faculty advice; and  
16
- 17 WHEREAS, The faculty have an interest in explicitly articulating what shared governance means at  
18 Cal Poly; therefore be it  
19
- 20 RESOLVED: The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject  
21 matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student  
22 life which relate to the educational process; and be it further  
23
- 24 RESOLVED: On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the trustees or delegated  
25 by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances,  
26 and for reasons communicated to the faculty; and be it further  
27
- 28 RESOLVED: It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity  
29 for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president; and be it  
30 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: January 25 2012

# 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.<sup>1</sup>

- 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

#### **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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup>

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 ACADEMIC SENATE DISTINGUISHED SCHOLARSHIP  
AWARDS COMMITTEE PROCEDURES**

- 1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the attached Distinguished  
2 Scholarship Awards Committee Procedures.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Distinguished  
Scholarship Awards Committee  
Date: February 1 2012



## **Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee Procedures**

### **Committee Description:**

The Distinguished Scholarship Awards (DSA) Committee oversees the Distinguished Scholarship Award, an Academic Senate award given yearly to two faculty members. The DSA 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 DSA 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 DSA 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).

### **Committee Membership:**

The DSA Committee observes the elements of committee membership 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 DSA Committee believes that the DSA 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 AS 602-03/RP&D. The DSA 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.

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), a two-page statement addressing the award criteria, and the names and contact information of three references who know the nominee and the nominee's work; at least one of these references should be from outside the Cal Poly community.

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

These procedures were approved by the DSA Committee in January 2012 and submitted to the Academic Senate Office on February 1, 2012.

DSA Procedures/ Track Change Document for 2012 revision /based on 2010 Procedures currently posted on Academic Senate Website. Purpose of revision: to update/clarify committee membership as impacted by AS-671-08 and to offer clearer procedural steps such as observation of deadlines and the requesting of references. Procedures still abide by the original guidelines and criteria established in AS-602-03/RP&D) except as impacted by the later resolutions AS-638-05 and AS-671-08. The information provided in this header are not part of the procedures, but is presented to clarify the need for the revisions (Additionally, such submission of procedures was one of the charges given to the 2012-13 DSA Committee.)

Revised: 01,31,12

Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee Procedure

Deleted: 3
Deleted: 09
Deleted: 0

Committee Description:

The Distinguished Scholarship Awards (DSA) Committee oversees the Distinguished Scholarship Award, an Academic Senate award given yearly to two faculty members. The DSA 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 DSA Committee was established in 2003-2004 as the Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee and originated as a spin-off committee from the Academic Senate Research and Professional Development Committee. The DSA 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).

Deleted: (originally
Deleted: )
Deleted:

Committee Membership:

The DSA Committee observes the elements of committee membership 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.

Formatted: Font: Italic
-------------------------

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

Deleted: Guidelines for the Cal Poly Distinguished Research, Creative Activity and Professional Development Award of May 28, 2003 (appended to Resolution AS-602-03/RP&D) describe the committee membership as follows. ¶ The awards committee shall include one voting General Faculty representative from each college, the UCTE, and Professional Consultative Services. Two voting ex officio student members shall be chosen to represent the ASI. The Senate is encouraged to include up to a maximum of three past award recipients among the college, UCTE, and PCS representatives. ¶ The composition stated in the original guidelines functions effectively. The inclusion of one member from each college assists the committee in evaluating the broad range of nominees and helps prevent biases for or against any given field of research.
--

Distinguished Scholarship Award Evaluation Procedure:

After nominations are received, the Academic Senate office screens nominees for eligibility based on the criteria attached to AS-602-03/RP&D. The DSA Committee chair then requests a short CV (five pages maximum) and a short statement (two paragraphs maximum) from all of the eligible nominees.

Deleted: established by
-------------------------



DSA Procedures/ Track Change Document for 2012 revision /based on 2010 Procedures currently posted on Academic Senate Website. Purpose of revision: to update/clarify committee membership as impacted by AS-671-08 and to offer clearer procedural steps such as observation of deadlines and the requesting of references. Procedures still abide by the original guidelines and criteria established in AS-602-03/RP&D) except as impacted by the later resolutions AS-638-05 and AS-671-08. The information provided in this header are not part of the procedures, but is presented to clarify the need for the revisions (Additionally, such submission of procedures was one of the charges given to the 2012-13 DSA Committee.)

The committee chair requests the CV and statement by email.  
The committee sets a deadline for 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), a two page statement addressing the award criteria, and the names and contact information of three references who know the nominee and the nominee's work; at least one of these references should be from outside the Cal Poly community.

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

These procedures were approved by the DSA Committee in January 2012 and submitted to the Academic Senate Office on February 1, 2012.

**Deleted:** se documents

**Deleted:** usually seven

**Deleted:** \*

**Deleted:** longer

**Deleted:** statements and full CVs.

**Deleted:** ,

**Deleted:** and after two or three meetings usually reaches a consensus.

**Deleted:** This colloquium is typically held in February.

Adopted:

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

**AS-\_\_\_\_-12**

**RESOLUTION ON  
CONCENTRATION DEFINITION**

- 1 WHEREAS, CSU Executive Order 602 delegates authority to campus presidents to approve options,  
2 concentrations, special emphases and minors ( <http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-602.pdf> );  
3 and  
4
- 5 WHEREAS, The only curricular constraint mandated by Executive Order 602 is that in order to  
6 be approved by campus presidents, concentrations must be “in the same discipline  
7 division as the approved degree major program” otherwise they require approval  
8 by the Chancellor; and  
9
- 10 WHEREAS, AS-388-92-CC revised the CAM definition and requirements of concentrations  
11 [411.A.1(c)] as follows:  
12       • A concentration is a block of at least five designated major courses (E.O. 283)  
13       or course areas.  
14       • No single course should appear in every concentration: such courses should be  
15       included in the major.  
16       • The courses for a concentration shall appear in the major course column<sup>1</sup>.  
17       • At least 50% of the units in a concentration shall be in the same courses or  
18       course areas for all students taking that concentration; and  
19
- 20 WHEREAS, A concentration is intended to be a coherent and specialized course of study  
21 within a student's major degree program, which presupposes knowledge of the  
22 major discipline; and  
23
- 24 WHEREAS, Faculty have the option to include concentrations in the baccalaureate programs  
25 they develop; and

---

<sup>1</sup> Major courses include all coursework that is neither solely GE nor free electives (these courses are often informally referred to as “major and support courses”)

- 26 WHEREAS, A concentration is a carefully chosen and formally recognized course of study  
27 with requirements stated in the catalog; and  
28
- 29 WHEREAS, Faculty have a commitment to deliver approved curriculum; and  
30
- 31 WHEREAS, Concentrations are noted on the student's transcript, but not shown on the  
32 diploma; and  
33
- 34 WHEREAS, Concentrations, including interdisciplinary concentrations, are not baccalaureate  
35 programs; be it therefore  
36
- 37 RESOLVED: That CAM 411.A.1(c) on concentrations be revised as follows:  
38       • A concentration is a block of at least five designated ~~major~~ courses (~~E.O. 283~~)  
39       from one or more lists of designated courses or course areas.  
40       • No single course should appear in every concentration: such courses should be  
41       included in the major.  
42       • The courses for a concentration shall appear in the major course column.  
43       • ~~At least 50% of the units in a concentration shall be in the same courses or~~  
44       ~~course areas for all students taking that concentration~~  
45       • The number of concentration units shall not exceed 50% of the total major  
46       units. And be it further  
47
- 48 RESOLVED: That the above CAM concentration criteria be effective for all new concentration  
49 proposals or concentration revision proposals beginning with the 2013-15 catalog  
50 cycle; and be it further  
51
- 52 RESOLVED: That when advising individual students, reasonable attempts to follow the  
53 approved curriculum should be made before substitutions are considered.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee  
Date: January 26 2012